

H. H. 15

A N
EXAMINATION
O F
Dr. C O M B E R's
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY
O F T H E
Primitive and General Use
O F
LITURGIES
I N T H E
Christian Church.

By S. B.

By Samuel Butler
Lecturia est quodcumq; pietatis officium, etiamsi à privato præstetur. If.
Casaub. exercit. in Baron. xvi. p. 383.

Nemo autem versatus in Græcorum Patrum lecticæ, ignorat, Lecturiam
per sæpe illis dici quicquid sit ad Deum colendum. Id. p. 384.

L O N D O N,
Printed for Richard Janeway in *Queens Head Alley* in *Pa-*
ter noster Row. MDCXC.

EXAMINATION

DE C O M M E N T A R I I S

SCHOLASTICAE HISTORIAE



LIT. ET CLAS.

IN THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

By A. S.

Presented to the Trustees of the British Museum
by the Hon. the Secretary of the Admiralty
in the year 1801

Entered for Library in Great Room 40 in 1801
The year 1801

TO THE READER.

Reader,

THE following Papers were writ some months since, and if the Author had known they would have been published at this time, I do not doubt but they would have been accompanied with the like account of what Doctor Comber hath produced for Liturgies in the Fourth Century. The Author is not one who is wedded to a Party; He hath often said, he knows not any one Party of a particular De-

A 2 nomination,

To the Reader.

nomination, but it hath some things which either do, or by reason of an alteration of circumstances, may deserve to be rectified. He thinks what is really good and commendable in every Party should be approved: And he wishes that what is not so, in every Party, might be universally understood, and laid aside, or amended. He is a Conformist, upon Principles he thinks he can justify, but which are more comprehensive than those which some appear to be influenced by in their Conformity. He useth the Liturgy of the Church of England in his Officiating in the Publick Worship, as fully as the Law requires. And he is so far from condemning the Publick Worship of Pious and Judicious Protestants who do not rye up themselves to Prescribed Forms, that he joins with them in their Publick Worship, as he hath opportunity. He is troubled to see so great an aversion to a General Union of Protestants in this Land, and that old Animosities are awakened out of their late Slumber. He is of opinion that the Church

To the Reader.

Church of England is much prejudiced by the Indiscretions of many who pretend an extraordinary Zeal for Her. The matters we differ about are very seldom rightly Stated. Arguments are not well adjusted to what is in debate. What is offered for proof, is too ordinarily put upon the Rack, and by overstraining it, it serves only for a Pompous Show, and is of no real use at all. Though Doctor Comber hath often expressed himself in such a manner, as would justifie some keen Reflections, yet this Author hath forbore them, because he would not willingly exasperate any man of Learning or Integrity. And therefore he hath mainly determined himself to a fair Representation of the Doctor's Authorities, which he hopes can yield no offence to any man of a sober and honest mind.

The Author of the following Papers doth think, that to do Liturgies right in a full Discourse (especially History) of that ~~matter~~ some notice should be taken of the various use of the word Liturgy in the Christian Church, and of the
time.

To the Reader.

time when it was first used with that strictness of signification, Mr. Clarkson hath assigned it, in his stating the point. For he saith, It was at first of a very general importance, and was not limited to Publick Offices. That when it came to be used in a more appropriate sense, it was applied particularly to every Publick Office. And that after it was in a special manner appropriated to Forms of Prayer, it had not for a long time, that strictness of signification it has in Mr. Clarkson's stating the matter. And he further conceives, that this is not the proper signification of a Liturgy as used and enjoined in the Church of England. Therefore he thinks, that instead of endeavouring to prove the Antiquity of Liturgies in that sense, we should rather endeavour to rectifie the mistake which hath unhappily arisen concerning a Liturgy, as enjoined and used in our Church.

Having given you this account of the Author, and his design in the following Papers, I leave you to peruse the Papers themselves, and judge to as you shall see fit, whether

To the Reader.

ther the Doctor have produced substantial Proof, that Liturgies, or Prescribed Forms of Prayer, were only, and unvariably used in the Christian Church during the Three First Centuries.

U

A T A

Printed by J. Smith, at the Press of the University of Cambridge, in the Year 1790.

ERRATA

To the Reader.

then the Doctor have produced substantial
Proof, that Liturgies, or Prescribed Forms
of Prayer, were only, and unreasonably used
in the Christian Church during the Three
First Centuries.

ERRATA.

P 2. l. ult. r. *proscribed*. p. 4. l. 29. for *truly*, r. *freely*. p. 6. l. 22. after
out, r. *of*. p. 16. marg. r. *vadv*. p. 18. l. 11. r. *Lucian*. p. 29. l. 9. for
truth, r. *proof*. p. 36. l. 6. dele *as*. p. 37. l. 29. after *subject*, r. *matter*. p. 38.
l. 11. after *any*, r. *other*. p. 40. l. 26. r. *παραχρησας*.

ERRATA.

((1))

AN EXAMINATION

OF
Dr. COMBERS Testimonies

FOR
LITURGIES

(During the three First Centuries) &c.

SIR,

ABOUT the middle of the last month, I received, by your order, 'Dr. Combers' 'Scholastical History of the Primitive and 'General use of Liturgies in the Christian 'Church, together with an Answer to 'Mr. David Clarkson's late Discourse concerning Liturgies. I now return you my thanks for it; and I would have done it sooner, but that some businesses called me from home immediately after I received it, even before I had time to peruse it. I now certify you that I have read it: And I do herewith send you what I take to be a true account of the meaning of those Testimonies the Doctor doth alledge in the three first Centuries, for Liturgies. I forbear many Reflections, which severall passages in the Doctor's Book would give

B

aban-

abundant occasion for. My design is little more than just to present you with the Doctor's quotations in their plain and entire sense. Your opinion of the Doctor's performance, I perswade my self, is not such, as will prejudice you against evidence. I therefore leave you to judge, whether his Authorities be to his purpose, and whether his Inferences be so rational, as he pretends his History is *Scholastical*; and whether his Book may properly be said to contain an Answer to Mr. *Clarkson's* Discourse of Liturgies.

You will make the easier and more just determination, if the matter be first a little stated: for then you will perceive what the Doctor should prove; And whether what he offers for proof, do reach the point he hath undertaken to discourse.

P. 2. Therefore you must be sure to remember, that Mr. *Clarkson* is far enough from asserting, that Forms of Prayer are intrinsically evil. 'He does not deny
'but there were some Forms of Prayer of old, viz.
'Arbitrary and particular, such as this or that person
'composed himself, or made choice of, composed by
P. 3. 'others, for his use in publick. He owns the Lords
'Prayer was used anciently, tho' far otherwise than of
P. 4. 'late. He grants that divers Churches had a certain
'order, wherein they agreed to administer the several
'parts of worship, and particularly the severals in the
'Sacraments, so as each had its known and fixed place.
'That this order was settled in some Churches by custom, and in some there was in time a Rule for it.
P. 5. 'He saith there was also some kind of uniformity in
'their Sacramental Prayers, that is, a general agreement to pray for the same things, tho' not in the same
Idem. 'words.

P. 2. He expressly relates what it is, which is the point in dispute. And declares: 'That by prescribing Forms are

'are meant, such as are imposed upon the Administram-
'tor, so as those must be used, and no other, nor
'otherwise, without adding, detracting, or transpo-
'sing. This (saith Mr. *Clarkson*) is it which is deni-
'ed, That in the Ancient Church, for many ages after
'Christ, such Liturgies and Forms of Prayer were com-
'monly imposed on those who administered the Sacra-
'ments, as are before described.

P. 6.

Thus you see what was denied, as well as what was
granted by Mr *Clarkson*, and therefore what the Do-
ctor was to prove. If the Doctor's quotations be not
home to this point, they do not reach that for which
he doth pretend to produce them. And whether for
the first three *Centuries* his Authorities do amount to
a proof of what is in dispute; yea or so much as of
Forms of Prayer, you may conclude as you shall see
fit, when you have considered the following account
of them.

Before I enquire into the passages the Doctor doth
quote for the proof of Liturgies in the particular *Cen-
turies*, as they come in their order, I will take notice
of a few passages which occur in his *Discourse concern-
ing the Grounds for Liturgies in Holy Scripture*, which
takes up some Pages, before he makes his entrance on
the First *Century*.

'The Doctor saith the Holy Bible makes it appear,
'that the People of God, from the beginning, did ge-
'nerally use Forms of Prayer and Praises in their Pub-
'lick worship. Now supposing this to be true, to
make it reach the present purpose, he should prove
they did not, nor might not use any Prayers or Praises,
but those very Forms; 'Yea (saith the Doctor) God
'prescribes a Form of Prayer for the penitent *Jews*, and
'charges them to take words with them, and turn to
'the Lord and say, *Take away all Iniquity, &c.* Hof.

P. 2.

Idem.

14. 2, 3, 4. 'Tis true, God doth command them to use words in their Prayers, and directs them what sort of words to use ; but let the Doctor answer when he thinks fit, whether God doth bind them to use no words but what are there mentioned ? But further, 'Forms of Prayer and Praise were indited by the Spirit of God for the publick service of the Temple, and 'commanded by the Lord to be used there. Is the inference from hence plain and just ; Therefore men may devise Prayers of their own, and oblige the Church to use these, and none but these.

The Doctor refers to Doctor *Hammond* and Doctor *Lighfoot*, for proof that the Jews had a fixed Liturgy ; whether their proof be solid touching that matter, would be too great a diversion to inquire. But if occasion required, I should not be afraid to undertake to produce the Authorities those two Learned Doctors build their proof, upon, for some things, the Learned will not allow, we must acquiesce in upon their testimony.

I will not insist on the difference betwixt the Jewish and Christian Church State. For we may suppose, Forms might be of general use among the Jews, and yet there be no necessity of an express abrogation of that way, to warrant peoples addressing themselves publickly to God in another way than by stinted Forms. For Prayer being commanded, and there being two ways wherein this duty might be performed, viz. by stinted Forms, and by expressing themselves truly, according to general Occasions, and particular Emergencies. There appears not any necessity that the use of Forms, as to the Lawfulness thereof, must of necessity be abrogated, in order to it's being Lawful to use the other way. But if we would prosecute the Doctors way of Arguing on this occasion, aright, something else

esse will follow than what the Doctor doth conclude, even what the Doctor, I am perswaded, would not be very willing to stand to. 'For seeing the Jews did worship God acceptably, &c. by set Forms, and Christ and his Apostles did joyn in these Forms, and never reprove the Jews for using them. The most obvious inference will be, That Christians must now use those very Forms, and none but them, unless those Forms be abrogated, and a positive institution of other Forms be left upon Record, either in the Gospels, or Epistles. For by the Doctors discourse, the Disciples had Forms of Prayers, which must certainly be Jewish Forms, and Christ only taught them another Form, which they were to add to those they had before; yea, according to what the Doctor relates, the Lord Jesus, when he provided his Disciples a New Form to be added to the rest, was not only so far from discharging people, and setting his Disciples free from the stinted way of Liturgies, but from their obligation to the Jewish Forms, 'That he would confine himself in the very Prayer he made them (whereby they were to be known from all others, to be his Disciples) to the Jewish Liturgy; so that there should not be one sentence in his Prayer, but what he took out of the Jewish Prayers then in use.

Now those who devote themselves to such notions as these, may do well to consider, whether if it be so (as the Doctor reportes) that Christ took every sentence of his Prayer out of the Jewish Prayers, and taught it his Disciples, that they might add it to their other Forms (which were Jewish) the obligation to use this as a Form of Prayer, and to use those other Forms, to which they were to add it, be not of equal duration? But alas! whether will some mens pretences to reading hurry them? What work will be made of Christianity

stianity, if the forced conceptions of some men who would be thought to have read much must be entertained? Some do represent matters in such a manner, as if they had a mind to perswade people, that the Lord Jesus was anointed with the Spirit, only to supply the meanness of his education, not to enable him to form and compose a Prayer himself, but only to collect and cull sentences out of other peoples Prayers, and then put them together into one form. Not many years ago other matters were represented at such a rate, by another hand, as if the Spirit had been given to the Apostles to furnish them immediately (because they had not been bred to such matters) with Philosophical notions, and some critical niceties, and particularly was given to St. *John* to enable him to write his Epistle in a Platonick strain. How far this sort of dealing may serve a particular interest for a while, I will not inquire. But it hath no probable tendency to promote the main design of Christianity.

P. 6.

“The Doctor saith that Christ in giving his Disciples a new Form (when they desired him to teach them to pray) and Copying the several Petitions out of the Jewish Liturgy, instead of intimating that he intended to reform the old method of praying by Forms, did shew his approbation of praying to God in a prescribed Form. But he might with as much clearness have pushed his inference from those premises further, *viz.* That he did shew his approbation (at least) of his Followers composing Forms of Prayer (if they are to compose any for constant publick use) only out of the Jewish Liturgies. I may further mind you that the Doctor doth ordinarily discourse too loosely concerning Forms of Prayer, as not being mindful of what he hath undertaken to discourse of. For if he find any words used in Prayer, which
were

were to be met with any where else before, those words he alleges for proof that the whole Prayer was a Form. Thus • Christ used a Form of Prayer on the 'Cross (saith the Doctor) extracted out of the 22^d. 'Psalm, which begins, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But pray who did extract the Petitions, and put them into a Form for him, and oblige him even on that occasion to use no other words, but what were ready provided to his hand.

P. 7.

In the next Paragraph the Doctor freely grants, 'that the Lords Prayer is not only a Form, but also a 'direction to draw other Forms by; so that we are not 'confined to the use of this Prayer, but have Liturgies 'which are drawn up by the Lords Prayer. But if we are not limited to the Lords Prayer, but may use *Liturgies which are no other words, but such as are agreeable to it, both as to the Form and Matter of them* (which is but an odd sort of expression to fall from a Learned Doctor) why may not Ministers, keeping to the direction of the Lords Prayer, use other words than those which are in the Liturgy, as well as those who are for Liturgies may use other words than those which are in the Lords Prayer? This Concession we have from the Doctor upon his taking notice that Mr. *Clarkson* had said, that the Lords Prayer was antiently used, but not out of any apprehension that Christ did, in *Mat. 6.* injoyn his Disciples to use it. Mr. *Clarkson* shews that some eminent persons, both antient and more late Writers, were of this opinion; whether his quoting so many for that particular, was to the purpose, I leave the indifferent Reader to determine. But because the Doctor saith, *Maldonat only tells us, we are not always bound to use those very words.* I would desire you to take notice, that *Maldonat's* words are, *Non his necessario verbis, &c.* Which I conceive do rather signi-

P. 9.

P. 3, 4.

P. 11.

signifie, we are not absolutely bound to use those very words at any time. But take the words if you please, according to the Doctors interpretation, if he think *Maldonat* in the right, provided such a construction may be borrowed for his words, that is, That we are not always bound to use our Lords very words; I would gladly know then, how we came to be bound to use always other people's words.

The Doctor next speaks of a Gift of Prayer, which he represents, as if we were to understand by it, 'an extraordinary assistance of the Spirit to teach men new words and phrases in ordinary cases, and for their daily prayers. Whereas by the gift of Prayer, no more is meant, than an Ability to represent the sentiments of a Soul duly affected with the general and particular subject matters of Prayer, in proper and suitable expressions, and such as are proper to beget, and excite, and improve such Resentments, and Affections in those who shall hear and join in the use of them, for that purpose. The gift of Prayer, soberly considered; does not imply any necessity (as the Doctor hints) constantly to vary, and use all new words. Indeed the exercise of this gift cannot very well consist with an obligation constantly to use the very same words. Nor is it usually pretended, that this is an extraordinary gift of the Spirit; but as by the blessing of the Spirit, the Heart or Soul comes to have a lively apprehension, and affectionate sense of what is to be subject matter of prayer; so the person, who is thus inwardly disposed, hath ordinarily a readiness to express himself in words, which bear some proportions to the disposition of his Soul and Spirit, and which are very proper to kindle and excite the like affections, dispositions, and inclinations in others who do seriously attend unto them.

them. Tho there are some particular words very pertinent to be used in prayer for general or particular mercies, yet there may be other words every jot as pertinent, which being used as occasion offers, may be more serviceable, and contribute more, to further the common or more appropriate end of Publick Prayer, than the constant use of the other words. The Lords Prayer doth comprehend the whole of Prayer. But yet those who are most for Liturgies, are for having other Forms framed, wherein the same things are asked in other words. Now those judicious persons who pray for the same things which are prayed for in prescribed Forms, without tying themselves up strictly to the words used in those Forms, do differ no more from the Forms which have not their words in them, than those Forms do from the Lords Prayer. And if the variation of Forms from the Lords Prayer may be truly beneficial and advantagious unto the people, why may not the like variations from Humane Forms be equally advantagious? I will propound one thing the more to explain this matter, which more nearly relates to the Doctor. He hath paraphrased the several Prayers in our *Common-Prayer Book*, so that the particular Prayers in that *Book*, are by his labour, and industry, and gift, made larger, and expressed in other words. The same things are requested, &c. in his larger Prayers, which are requested in the shorter Prayers in our *Common Book*. Now let him consider whether he had not such apprehensions, and affections in his mind and soul, relating to the particulars petitioned, and confessed, &c. in the Prayers contained in our *Common Book*, at that time, as he thought might be more commodiously and advantagiously expressed and represented, than they were by the words

used in the *Book*? Or whether such expressions did not occur to him, as he thought would, if duly attended to, help peoples devotions more, than the very words of the *Common Prayers* would by themselves? He certainly had some design in varying and altering the words; and I am willing to believe he had an honest design. Now if his using other expressions about the same matter, and altering Forms of Prayer, so as to make of short Prayers long ones, is of real use to promote devotion, why may not others variations be in their measure useful too? If it should be said, that his variations, are not to be used publickly, I ask whether they be ever the better for that? Or whether his variations are the more useful, because only for private use? What hinders, but if those variations are proper to answer the ends for which they were devised, viz. the helping of people to perform the duty of Prayer with more understanding, and better affections, other variations in publick may be equally useful?

P. 16.

If, as the Doctor doth grant, 'every good man may 'by the ordinary assistance of the spirit be moved to 'pray with *Devotion* and *Fervency*: That is (as I conceive) may have his soul enlightned, and possessed with a true apprehension and knowledge of his spiritual concerns, and vigorously affected with them, and carried out towards God in fervent desires, inclinations, and affections suitably to his present occasions; What reason can be rendered why he may not by the ordinary assistance of the spirit be enabled to express his inward resentments in proper expressions? The gift of utterance being the gift of the spirit, as well as other gifts. Mens discourses are usually answerable to their apprehensions and affections. What we darkly apprehend, we express obscurely: and what we under-

understand distinctly and clearly, we discourse of plainly.

The principal thing, indeed, in Prayer is the frame and actings of our Souls; the inward exercise of Faith, Repentance, Love, and other Graces. But, saith the Doctor, any good man may act these in the use of a Form. And therefore may pray in, or by the Spirit in the use of a Form. But I say it must still be noted, that if a man be to pray with others, (and that which we are now discoursing, is concerning one that by way of Office is to perform this duty in the hearing of others) so as to have them joyn with him in this performance, he must use words, and if he restrain himself to the words devised and put together by others, and these words do not so well express and represent the sense he hath, and which others should have of what is the matter of Prayer, as others which do occur unto him, and which he could very pertinently make use of for that purpose; he cannot be truly said to pray in or by the Spirit, according to the full import of that phrase. But, saith the Doctor, then no man in the Publick Assemblies, doth pray in the Spirit, but the Minister, for the Minister alone conceives the Prayer, and it is a Form to the whole Congregation, who must pray in his words. To which I answer, That the matter in dispute at present, is only concerning him that officiates. Besides, it is not a Form to the Congregation, taking a Form in the sense we are now discoursing of. But the Congregation may joyn in the Spiritual Performance of this Duty, acting graces suitably to the occasions which are administred, and improving for this purpose, the Abilities God hath bestowed upon others, in order to the furthering and promoting of their devotion. This is the work which pertains unto the Congregation at that time; they not being called to express vocally their inward relentments, (during

the Ministers officiating in this performance) in the fittest expressions they are able.

The Doctor seems to be of the opinion, that in the Apostles days, there was an extraordinary gift of Prayer which some did partake of, and that their Prayers were Divine Revelations, ' They being immediately furnished by the Spirit, both with the Matter ' and Words of their Prayers; and that these Prayers ' were written down, and after that gift failed, they ' were preserved and used by the Church, and were ' transmitted down to us by their Successors. So that by this sort of discoursing, our Liturgies are Divine Revelations. But the Doctor hath none of the Ancients but *St. Chrysostom* to vouch for an Extraordinary Gift of Prayer in the Primitive Times. This is certain, before the Liturgies now extant, or any part of them which is not expressly contained in the Books of the *Old* and *New Testament*, will be owned by good Christians and sound Protestants for Divine Revelations, very substantial particular proof must be made of their being such. To father Liturgies in such an arrogant presumptuous manner, on the Holy Spirit, is not the way to bring them into credit with judicious and serious people. It may effectually provoke God to pour forth in a little time so much contempt upon them, they shall never get into repute any more. This is further certain, that our latest Liturgies have some prayers in them, which by the very make of them, any ordinary person may perceive they were not composed by Divine Inspiration. And if the other could be proved to be of such an original, surely these will not deserve to be thought the more venerable, meerly because they have been added unto them. Having said thus much concerning some passages in the Doctors Introduction, before he enters upon

upon the First Century : I will now briefly consider the Testimonies he doth alledge for Liturgies

In the First Century.

And he labours first of all to prove what he hath undertaken, by asserting that 'the *Essenes* (who have been believed by divers learned men to be Christians) had Forms of Prayer, for *Josephus* saith they used Prayers which they received from their Forefathers, which must be Forms ; and *Philo* saith they did sing alternately ; and *Eusebius* calls these, the Hymns sung amongst us Christians. And that excellent Historian labours to prove these *Essenes* were Christians by this Argument amongst some others, Because they prayed and sung Hymns in set Forms, as the Christians use to do. Thus far the Doctor. And I do readily acknowledge that *Eusebius* doth indeavour from what he finds in *Philo*, to prove the *Essenes* to be Christians: And particularly from their way of singing Psalms, and Hymns. But he doth not say one word of their having set Forms of Prayers : That *they prayed in set Forms, as the Christians use to do*, is the Doctor's own saying, for *Eusebius* doth neither say the *Essenes* had Forms of Prayers, nor that the Christians did use any. And yet *Eusebius* doth say, That *Philo's* Book doth comprehend in it the Rules of the Church. *Τῆς ἐκκλησίας περιέχει κανόνας.* *Valesius* thinks this doth import, that that Book did contain in it all the Rules or Canons which were observed by the Christian Church in *Eusebius's* time. Further, *Eusebius* doth gather out of that Book what he thought was proper to shew how exactly these *Essenes*, and the Christians did agree in their Ecclesiastical Affairs, as he himself assures us in the Chapter before referred

P. 28, &c.

Euseb. Hist. lib.
2. c. 17.

referred unto ; And yet saith not one word of praying by set Forms ; which rather intimates there were no set Forms of Prayer used by the Christians in his time, seeing he omits the mention of the Forms the *Essenes* used, if as *Josephus* reports the *Essenes* had Forms of Prayer.

In the next place the Doctor thinks he hath a proof of Liturgies in *Clemens Romanus*. But whoever considers *Clemens*, will soon perceive that the passages the Doctor hath been pleased to quote, are nothing at all to the present purpose. For *Clemens* had been perswading the *Corinthians* to lead a godly life, and to abstain from all kinds of vices, and to behave themselves with such respect and kindness one towards another, as did become them : And particularly he presses them all to observe the Offices and Duties which did pertain to them according to their particular stations, capacities, conditions, places, gifts, endowments and acquirements, certifying them, that whatever state and condition any man was in, whether he were rich or poor, strong or weak, he had some special business to mind ; or whatever his endowments and acquirements were, whether he were wise, humble, chaste, &c. these were received from the Lord, and he must give God thanks for them. He saith that there is some business and work God hath obliged every man unto, answerable to the state and circumstances he is in ; and this appearing to be so, by the Holy Scriptures, we all ought to do the Offices God hath enjoined us, according as our circumstances are, in the order and manner he hath appointed them to be done. In short, he tells them that people have a dependance one upon another, and God hath provided every man, whatever his condition is, a business, office and work, (which *Clemens* names *αἰσχυρία*) which he is to attend unto, doing

doing every part of his Work, or Liturgy, in the manner God hath prescribed, and in the season he hath appointed, and what ever good he doth enjoy, or excellent qualification he is endued with, he is wholly beholden to God for it, and must therefore be careful to give thanks unto him for it. This he confirms, and illustrates by shewing that among the Jews, the High-priest had his business, and the Priests had theirs, and the Levites theirs, and the People had their works, which they were all in their several stations to attend unto and perform; from whence he inforces his exhortation to the *Corinthians*, that they would all mind their own business, do the work which God had appointed them in their places, be content with their own station, give God thanks for what they had, keeping a good conscience, ordering themselves modestly, decently, not transgressing the bound God had fixed for every persons Work, Office, or Liturgy;

ἵνα ὁ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστος τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον ὡς ὃν ὁ κύριος ἰδοὺς τὸν θεόν, ὡς ἀγαθὴ συνειδήσας ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνειν τὸν ὁρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα ἐν σεμνότητι.

Epist. ad Corinth. edit. Helmesf. pag. 53.

What the Doctor alledgeth from *Pliny*, refers only to singing of Psalms, or Hymns. Indeed he would fain draw in Prayers along with them, though his Author say never a word concerning their Prayers, much less that they prayed constantly in the use of Forms, which were imposed upon them. The Doctor says that '*Plinies Account agrees exactly with that of the Essenes, and they having Forms of Prayer, we must conclude the Christians had also. Inquire not what necessity there is to conclude thus. Concerning the Essenes, and their agreement with the Christians, I have spoken already. Nor is Plinies Account exact, if we believe the Account Eusebius doth give of the Essenes.*

The

πρότερον ἐπὶ
τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν
τῇ προσευ-
χῇ ἡμᾶς συν-
ῶχεν, μὴ
δύσας ἔσθ
κοιτῇ, οἷον ἰὺς,
μὴ ἐλπίς,
&c.

Ignat. ad
Magnes.
πάντες ὡς εἰς
εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν
συντρέχοντες,
&c. Id.

The Doctor hath but one Author more to quote in this Century for Liturgies, and that is *Ignatius*. And because *Ignatius* hath these words, *μὴ δύσας*: He concludes he hath a solid proof of a fixed Liturgy. But if you consult *Ignatius* his Epist. ad *Magnes*. You will find that the Doctor hath not given the plain sense of the place. He is perswading them of *Magnesia*, not to be offended with, or condemn their Bishop, because of his youth, but to reverence him, and adhere firmly to his Communion, and come all together ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (translate it how you please) to Prayer, that so their Prayer and Supplication might be one. *Ignatius* doth not call their Prayer and Supplication one, because they used one Form of Prayer, but on the account of their joyning together in the performance of that Duty. His next quotation out of *Ignatius ad Smirn*. is no more to his purpose than the former. Such expressions there are in the Epistle as the Doctor doth mention; but I think, if you consider the Epistle you will readily perceive that they do import no more than his declaration, that their Bishops Communion was Orthodox and Sound, Divine Ordinances being celebrated in his Church as they ought to be; therefore he would have them adhere firmly to his Communion, who will not perform himself, or allow others to perform the Celebration of the Eucharist or Baptism, otherwise than the Scripture doth warrant, And all that he saith of this kind, is only to secure the people from partaking in any administrations which might be corrupted by those who were infected, according to the account he gave in the former part of the Epistle. But there is not a word of prescribed Forms that I can find in the whole Epistle. It seems a little strange to me, the Doctor should be so concerned to have *Ignatius* (according to *Secrates* his Relation) own-

ed to be the first that brought the usage of singing by way of Antiphone into the Church of Antioch ; And that he should pretend that Theodoret's silence, concerning this matter, might proceed from his taking it for granted and supposing it was generally owned and known For the report of this matter, as it is in Socrates is generally, by Learned men, passed over as Fabulous and Chimerical; and Theodoret is as positive, and express that Flavianus and Diodorus were the first that brought that way of Singing into that Church, as an Historian can well be. His words are these (speaking of Flavianus and Diodorus) ἔτιτοι πρῶτοι διχῇ διαλόντες τῆς τῶν Ψαλλόντων χορᾶς, ἐκ διαδοχῆς ᾄδον τὴν Δευτέρικὴν ἐδ' ἑκάστην μελωδίαν. And Valessus certifies that Theodorus Mopsuestenus who lived at the same time with Flavianus and Diodorus, doth testify the very same thing, declaring that they had it from the Syrians. Having given you this account of the Doctors Quotations out of the Writers in the first Century, I will consider what Evidence he hath for Liturgies

Theodor. Eccles. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 24.

Annot. in lib. 6. Hist. Eccles. Socrat. p. 78.

In the Second Century.

The first passage he alledgeth in this Century is out of Lucian (as he truly saith) a jeering Pagan The Doctor is of opinion that the Religious Assembly he describes, was a Christian Church. I think he had a design to ridicule all Religious Worship, and the better to effect his design, he jumbles some things in the Christian Worship, and some things in the Pagan Worship together, adding also what did occur to him, which he thought would contribute to the rendering of a Religious Assembly thoroughly diverting, and grateful to a prophane Genius. The passage the Doctor quotes out of this Author is this ; τὸ ἐν ἑκτῷ ἀπὸ πα-

Lucian Phil. lib. π.

τοῦ ἀρχαίου, ὃ τὸν πρῶτον ἀδελφὸν οἱ τέλος ἐπιθεῖς. *That*
Prayer which began with the Father, and ended with the
Hymn of many Names. Now *Lucian* doth not say, that
 he heard this Prayer in that Assembly which hath
 been described in that Dialogue. But acquaints him, he
 had brought in relating what passed there, that he had
 not patience to hear any more of that sort of stuff,
 and that a farther discourse about such matters, would
 have the same effect on him, as a story would, con-
 cerning a Prayer beginning and ending as is before men-
 tioned. Which though *Julian* might design as a re-
 flection on the Christians way of Praying, yet for
 ought I know, it imports no more, than if you should
 tell me a Story of peoples beginning their Prayer, as if
 they worshipped but one person, and yet should conclude
 their Prayer in such a manner, as if they had been Pray-
 ing all the while to a great many persons. The Do-
 ctor thinks that *Lucian* doth by this Prayer mean the
 whole Communion Office. But this is only conjecture.
 I will say no more of that, but only mind you, that
 when the Doctor suspected his evidence for Liturgies
 in this Century would not be very clear, he assigned
 this for his Reason; 'We have no Authors, who had
 'occasion to Write particularly of the Church Service,
 'which they cared not to publish, lest the Pagans un-
 'der whom they lived, should deride or blaspheme their
 'Sacred Mysteries. And yet in the next Page, to serve
 a turn we must have the most jeering Pagan that Age
 did afford admitted to take a view of their Admini-
 stration during their whole Communion Office. But
 suppose *Lucian* was really at a Christian Assembly,
 and did hear there a Prayer which began with the Fa-
 ther, and ended with an acknowledgement of, and an
 ascription of Glory and Honour, in variety of expressi-
 ons, to every Person in the Trinity (as is very usual with
 those

those who do not bind themselves in all their Prayers, to a precise number of words) might not he give that description of that Prayer, which is before related, and yet there be no prescribed Liturgy imposed on that Assembly?

The next Author, the Doctor hath recourse unto, is *Justin Martyr*. Whether *Justin Martyr*, undertaking to write an Apology for the Christians, and in particular for their Church Service, had not occasion to write particularly of their Church Service, I leave the indifferent and unprejudiced Reader to judge. The Doctor doth acknowledge that 'he doth often speak of the Christian Assemblies, and of the several Duties there performed, &c. Now if they were tied up to the constant use of a precise number of Words in their Prayers, tho he might not think it convenient to report their words, yet what can be imagined to obstruct his declaring they did celebrate their Offices in stinted Forms? But, saith the Doctor) 'when *Justin Martyr* mentions Baptism, he only saith, They are taught 'to Fast and Pray, and ask of God the forgiveness of 'their former Sins, and being brought where water is, 'they are Regenerated in the same manner as we were 'Regenerated; from whence the Doctor infers, that 'even in his time they began to conceal the particular 'manner of Celebrating these Mysteries. Now I conceive the Doctor is under some mistake, as to this Passage: for *Justin Martyr* doth immediately relate in what manner they were Regenerated. *They are Regenerated in the same manner as we were Regenerated; for* (saith *Justin Martyr*) *they are then washed in Water, in the Name of the Father of all things, and Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.* And then he proceeds to some extent, in explaining and shewing the reason of all this; so that here appears not any intent that he had, to conceal any thing that

P. 31.

*Ibid.*Just. Mar.
Apol. 2.

was in use amongst them. But notwithstanding *Justin Martyr's* reservedness, in the Doctor's opinion, the Doctor meets 'with some general expressions which 'incline him to believe they had Forms in his time. 'He will not insist upon his saying they prayed for the 'Conversion of the Jews, and the Deliverance of the 'Gentiles from their errors, and for all men, though 'these are pieces of Antient Litany. I only ask whether these things cannot be prayed for, unless people be bound up to the constant use of particular prescribed words? And whether there be any evidence that *Justin Martyr* borrowed this account from any Litany?

P. 32.

Just. Mar.
Apol. 2.

'The Doctor next observes that when *Justin Martyr* speaks of the bringing the newly Baptized person 'to the place where the Faithful Worshipped God, 'he saith they there made Common Prayers for themselves, for the person Baptized, and for all other men every where with great fervency. Now (saith the Doctor) *Common Prayers do signify Forms that are known to all, and in which all may joyn.* But I answer, the question is not, what Common Prayers do signifie now; but whether *Justin Martyr* by *κοινὰς εὐχὰς* did mean set prescribed Forms, which they must constantly use, and from which they must not on any account vary? Here doth not appear any thing to incline us to think he meant prescribed Forms. But his very next words intimate the Reason why he called them Common Prayers [They made Common Prayers for themselves, for the person Baptized, and for all other men every where] viz. because they did all hold Communion in offering up Prayers to God, and their Prayers were not limited to themselves, but did extend to the whole Community of Mankind. What the Doctor doth here alledge out of *Ignatius*, hath been considered already; what he produceth out of *St. Cyprian* shall be considered when

when I come to his quotations out of that Author, where you will meet again with this same passage.

In the next place the Doctor reports a passage which Mr. *Clarkson* cites out of *Justin Martyr*, about which they do both make some stir. The passage is this; ὁ πρεσβυτερος εὐχαρις ὁμοίως, καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅσον δύναμις αὐτοῦ ἀναπύμπη. *The President in like manner offers up Prayers and Thanksgivings, as well as he is able.* Mr. *Clarkson* urges this as a proof, that he who did officiate in the Publick Worship, was not tied up to the use of Prescribed Forms, but did pray and give thanks according to his ability. And he produceth many testimonies to prove that ὅσον δύναμις here used doth import so much. The Doctor undertakes to prove that that phrase doth signifie otherwise in this place. 'For (saith the Doctor) ὅσον δύναμις answers to εὐτότως in the place before 'cited, and that declares the Prayers at Baptism (He 'should have said after Baptism) were made fervently, 'or with all their might. He endeavours to confirm this interpretation by producing some other passages, where the phrase seems to be of this importance. And then determines, that 'When we desire the several 'things prayed for in a Form, with all the earnestness 'and vigor we can, we may properly be said to pray 'ὅσον δύναμις, as well as we are able, or to the utmost 'of our power. So that the power here spoken of, 'refers to the affections, and not to the phrases and expressions of him that prays.

To all this I have these things to say; 1. *Justin Martyr* doth not refer us to the passage the Doctor hath recourse to, for the explaining of this phrase by εὐτότως, but doth expressly refer us to what he had related a little before, where he saith the President offereth up Prayers and Praises to God, &c. and gives thanks

thanks for the benefits and gifts he vouchsafeth in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, *ὅτι πολὺ* [*εὐχαριστῶν* *ὡς τῶν καλῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ ὅτι πολὺ ποιεῖται*] which, for any thing I do yet understand to the contrary, may signifie *largely, distinctly, and with variety of expressions*. So that if we must interpret *ὅτι δύναμις* by what goeth before in *Justin Martyr*, we must explain it by this: For this is what *Justin Martyr* doth expressly refer us unto in this place. 2. Tho this phrase doth signifie fervently, and so refers to the affections, I do not understand any reason that can pertinently be alledged, why this should exclude him who officiates, from using his utmost ability to express his inward devotion, in the best manner and fittest words he can, to help the devotion of those persons who join with him in the Service. Put the Case, a Minister doth in Publick use a Prescribed Form of Prayer, and desires the several things prayed for in that Form, with all the earnestness and vigour he can; but yet perceives the words of that Form do not represent and express his inward resentments and devout affections in so vivid and proper a manner, for the helping and assisting of his hearers devotion, as he is able to represent them by his own expressions; I dare refer it to the Doctor, whether he may properly be said to pray in the use of that Form, as well as he is able, and to the utmost of his power. I will allow he doth pray fervently and devoutly; but I think it will be hard to perswade any man of sense, that he doth pray as well as he is able; unless we must be forced to grant, that a man may properly be said to pray as well as he is able, tho at the same time he is able to pray better than he doth. 3. As for all the quotations the Doctor alledgeth to prove that *ὅτι δύναμις* doth note fervency and vigorous affections: I leave the Doctor to look them over again, and consider

consider whether his Authors do mean no more than vigorous affections, and had any design to exclude peoples using their best abilities, for the most advantageous outward performance of their Work and Duty.

The Doctor further observes, with reference to this passage, 'That this phrase doth only relate to the Hymns used in the Eucharist, and these Hymns were known Forms. To which I answer? 1. I think it equally relates to the Prayers and Thanksgivings which were celebrated on that occasion; and I leave any indifferent person, who understands the passage, to conclude (when he looks upon it as it lies in the Author) as he shall see reason, whether it doth relate more to the one, than to the other. 2. Tho Hymns may be, and often are used for celebrating the praises of God, yet that is not the only way whereby we may offer up our Praises and Thanksgivings to God. 3. *Justin Martyr* speaks here expressly of the Presidents offering up particular thanks for the benefits exhibited and vouchsafed in the *Eucharist*; and speaks of his performing the Offices of Prayer and Praise himself, without any audible concurrence of the people during the whole Service. Yea, he further acquaints us, that when the President hath finished these Offices, then it is the people do speak, testifying their joyful approbation by saying *Amen*. This is the account he gives us himself of this matter but a very little before the passage now insisted on, and whither he refers us in this very place, for the more distinct apprehending of his meaning here.

'But, saith the Doctor, all Christians are said to worship God and his Son, according to their ability, with Prayer and Praise; and private Christians we may be sure were not allowed to make their own Prayers
'and

‘and Praises in Publick Worship *extempore*. To this I answer, That the matter in dispute at present, is concerning him that Officiates. And all the stir which is made about this phrase, in the present case, amounts (I think) to no more than this, whether a Minister may properly be said to pray to the utmost of his ability, when he doth not pray to the utmost of his ability: Which in my apprehension is a very plain case, if people were free from prejudice. Well, but it may be enquired how the people can be said in the Publick Worship to pray according to the utmost of their abilities? I answer their circumstances are not the same with his, who is to officiate; And therefore this phrase hath not the same importance when applied to the one, and when extended to the other. The people are said to pray to God, and to praise him according to the utmost of their ability in the Publick Worship, when they do make the best improvement they can, of the use he who doth officiate, doth make of the abilities he is indued with for the celebrating of these Offices, to the furthering of their own devotion.

P. 38.

There is one thing more the Doctor doth take notice of, with reference to the phrase we have been discoursing of. And that is this; He saith, ‘We are only to consider this phrase here, as it is applied to praying and praising God. And there it never signifies ‘doing these things *extempore* (he should have said according to the best of those abilities with which God hath endued them, who are to celebrate these Offices) ‘but doing them very devoutly. Now whether inward devotion in these Services be all this phrase doth import, with reference to them who are to Officiate, I refer to what I have already said about that matter. I will further only mind you, that tho
the

the Doctor hath taken notice of some of the quotations Mr. *Clarkson* hath produced for the signification of this phrase in other cases, yet he hath not said one word here by way of reply to those instances Mr. *Clarkson* hath given, expressly relating to the cases wherein he doth acknowledge the phrase is at present to be considered. The instances Mr. *Clarkson* hath produced, relating to Prayer and Praise, you may find in the 118, 119, 120 pages of his Discourse concerning Liturgies.

The Doctor having done with *Justin Martyr*, proceeds to *Ireneus*, out of whom he alledgeth only one passage, which is, that '*Ireneus* relates that the Hereticks, to prove their phancies, did alledge that we '(that is, the Orthodox) in our Thanksgivings, do 'say world without end. From hence the Doctor concludes, that 'these words being the very conclusion 'of the *Gloria Patri*, the Christians praised God in 'publick by this very Form which we now use; Glory be to the Father, &c. Now, allowing the Christians did usually in his time use this Doxology, how will this prove they were stinted in their Publick Worship to a prescribed Liturgy? But according to my apprehension, this is no proof, that this Doxology was then in use; unless it can be made appear, that *εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας ἢ αἰῶνον*, cannot conclude any Praise and Thanksgiving but this Doxology. The business in short is thus; *Ireneus* is shewing how absurdly those Hereticks did endeavour to prove their conceit of their *Æones*, which was by urging every sentence where they found the word *αἰών*, or *αἰῶνας*, as a proof of what they asserted. Amongst other things they pleaded that the Orthodox did usually conclude their Praises with saying, for ever and ever, or as the Doctor will have it, world without end. *Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς* *Iren. adv. Hæc.*
ἐν *lib. 1. c. 1.*

ὅτι τῆς εὐχαριστίας λέγοντας, εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Now all that can fairly be inferred from hence, I think, is this, that the Christians did usually conclude their Praises with these words, for ever and ever. And if no Prayers or Praises but prescribed Forms can conclude with these words, I am contented that this should pass for a proof of stinted Forms in *Ireneus* his time. But if Prayers and Praises, which are not Prescribed Forms, may conclude, and ordinarily are concluded with these words, I leave the Doctor to consider whether his alledging this for a proof of a fixed Liturgy, be not a way of arguing very like that which was used by those *Ireneus* did write against? *Tertullian* shall be considered when he comes in order, and then you may judge of the Doctors Inference.

P. 40.

Clem. Alex.
Strom. 7.

The next Author the Doctor makes use of, is *Clemens* of *Alexandria*: Out of whom a passage is quoted, concerning which he and Mr. *Clarkson* do differ, touching the meaning of it. The passage is this; *The Church is not only the name of the place for Publick Worship, but the Congregation prostrating themselves in Prayers, having all, as it were, one common voice, and one mind.* The dispute is concerning the meaning of *μὴν ὡς πᾶς ἔχον φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν*. Mr. *Clarkson* thought the Congregation had one voice in respect of the Ministers speaking in their stead, one for all. 'The Doctor thinks it signifies the performing the Offices of Prayer and Praise in a responsory way, which must be in known Forms, because the people not only joined in heart with the Minister, but vocally answered in their turns, they and the Priest often making up the sentence between them; and therefore they are said to have, as it were, one common voice. I leave the Learned to determine which of them is in the right, as to the sense of this phrase: And will only acquaint you, that I think

I think, if the way of Responsory Prayers, and Praises, had been antecedently proved to be the ordinary way of the Christian Church in the Primitive Ages, there would have been something to countenance the Doctors interpretation. But to interpret this place thus, can be no proof for Liturgies, because the interpretation is built upon a supposition, and takes that for granted, which it is alledged to prove. Besides, if the people did vocally answer in their turns, and they and the Priest did often make up the sentence between them, as the Doctor affirms; I think in thus doing, they could hardly be said to have, as it were, one common voice, for they would evidently have two common voices. The Priest having one common voice for himself and them, in his part of the sentence, and the People another common voice, for themselves and the Priest, in their part of the sentence. It does indeed exceed my reach to comprehend a Reason why the Congregation may not be said to have one common voice in Prayer and Praise, when they have appointed or chosen a Priest to officiate in their name, and do concur and join with him in those Offices. No nor why they may not be said to have, as it were, one common voice, in the Doctors notion of that phrase, when they do testifie their approbation of what he hath said (as *Justin Martyr* assures us they did) by saying *Amen*. But, saith the Doctor ' If the ' Minister had said all the Prayers, he, (i. e. *Clemens*) ' must have said plainly, they had one common mouth, ' or voice, but his words are, having, *as it were*, one ' common voice. I leave you to consider, whether their answering *Amen* is not enough to remove this scruple. Only you may take notice that the Doctor is of opinion that *Clemens* doth allude here to those words of *St. Paul, Rom. 15. 6.* And *St. Paul* speaks there

there of glorifying God with one mouth, not, *as it were* with one. mouth. The Doctor further observes from *Clemens*, 'that the Christians allotted several 'hours for Prayer, in imitation of *Daniel* and the *Jews*, 'and hence concludes it likely, that because the *Jews* 'had Forms of Prayer, they did imitate them in these 'too. I think it needless' to make any Reply to this, because it is a forced way of reasoning, and is at best, all over meer conjecture. But, saith the Doctor, 'would 'those who prayed so often, vary the phrase every 'time? Now this is not at all to the point, for that which the Doctor should prove, is, that they were obliged constantly to use the very same words. The Doctor further tells us, 'That *Clemens* doth not relate what 'were the words of their Forms. There the Doctor speaks very right, but withall I must add, he never relates that they had any Forms. But *Clemens* tells us what were their main Petitions. And the Doctor saith, 'These matters they asked, were such, it was most fit 'to ask them in a set Form of words. That is one Doctors opinion. But if the Christians of that Age were of another opinion, what becomes of the Doctors argument? And he must give some evidence they were of his opinion, before what he asserts will pass for proof in the present case. But, saith the Doctor, 'If they had prayed for these things *extempore*, *Clemens* could not be so positive in the method as he 'seems to be. To which I make this reply, *viz.* *Clemens* reports the methods of Christians private devotions every jot as particularly, as that quotation he insists on, with relation to Publick Prayers, doth relate their method: Whether that I speak of be the very same the Doctor refers unto, I will not affirm, but it seems to have some affinity, and I am sure it is in the same Book his Margin refers to. If it should be the

the same the Doctor means, you will easily perceive how little it is to his purpose. And why should the Doctor think it strange, *Clemens* could be so positive (as naming three general heads of Prayer doth amount to) in the method of their Publick Prayers: tho they did not use a fixed prescribed Liturgy? Seeing he is every jot as positive in the method of their Private Prayers, unless they all used the same Forms in private too? The truth of which I am perswaded the Doctor hath no inclination to undertake. Now *Clemens* tells Strom. lib. 6. p. 665. us that the true Christian, [or as he terms him, *ὁ πρῶτος*] doth pray every hour. And that he doth first ask remission of sin; then that he may not sin again; then, that he may do well, and understand both Creation and Providence; and that his Heart being made clean by the Knowledge which he hath by the Son of God, he may attain to see God face to face. Such a passage as this relating to Publick Prayers out of one of the Ancients, would be look'd on by some men, as a swinging proof of a prescribed Liturgy. I leave you to divert your self with the Doctor's dextrous device, to furnish people with an Expedient to enable them to Pray by Book, with their Eyes and Hands lift up to Heaven.

The Doctor hath one Author more, whom he quotes in this *Century*, and that is *Tertullian*. 'In P. 43.
'whose works (he saith) we have sufficient evidence
'that they used Forms of Prayer and Praise. The
passages he is concerned with out of this Author,
are of two sorts. 1. Such as he alledgeth to prove
the use of a Liturgy at that time. 2. Such as
Mr. *Clarkson* produceth to prove the contrary, which
the Doctor endeavoureth to make appear, do not
answer the end for which that Author brings them.
I will first consider the passages the Doctor alledgeth

Tertul. de Orat.
p. 788.

as sufficient evidence that the Christians used Publick Forms of Prayer and Praise in his time. His first proof is this; That *Tertullian* declares, That Christ hath fixed a new Form of Prayer for us, who are his Disciples, viz. The Lords Prayer, which he expounds in a peculiar Tract, and in divers places calls it *The Lawful and the Ordinary Prayer*. I do acknowledge *Tertullian* near the beginning of his Book, *De Oratione*, hath this passage; — *Jesus Christus Dominus Noster, nobis Discipulis Novi Testamenti, Novam Orationis Formam determinavit*. The Great Question is, What *Tertullian* did mean by *Novam Orationis Formam*? The Doctor saith it was the Lords Prayer, which he expounds in a peculiar Tract. I think his meaning was otherwise; And that he did intend no more by that Phrase, than a new Instruction or Direction how to perform the Duty of Prayer, which he saith was necessary to the Gospel State or Administration: *Oportebat enim in hac quoque specie Novum Vinum novis utribus recondi*. And though *Tertullian* doth expound the Lords Prayer in that Tract, yet he doth consider it in his explaining of it, not as the whole he understands by his *Nova Forma*, but as an instance and example of one of the General Instructions our Saviour had laid down for the guiding of us in the performance of this Duty. He doth in a little time, even before he begins his explanation of the Lords Prayer, alter his phrase, and calls it *Orandi Disciplina*. And then tells us this New Way or Instruction for Prayer, did consist of several parts. The third he mentions is *Brevity*: Which he explains by our not laying any stress on the use of a confused heap of words, but our using such words as are proper and very comprehensive. And then he certifies us, that our Lord hath given us an admirable

mirable example of this Brevity, which is the third part of his *Nova Orationis Forma*, or the Third Precept Christ enjoined to be observed in the performance of this Duty. *Et tamen Brevitas ista, quod ad tertium Sophiæ Gradum faciat, magnæ ac beatæ interpretationis substantia fulta est.* And his principal business in his expounding the Lord's Prayer, (which he immediately subjoins) is to shew how comprehensive our Saviour was in this Prayer, tho it was so short, or consisted of so few words. But notwithstanding *Tertullian* doth expound every part of the Lords Prayer, yet he doth not strictly tie himself to the method observed in the Lord's Prayer. As for *Tertullians Legitima & Ordinaria Oratio*, it Id. p. 791. seems to be just the same with his *Ordinata Religio Orationis*. Which I conceive is another phrase of the same import with his *Nova Orationis Forma*, and his *Orandi Disciplina*. Which (I think) do only signify the General Instructions Christ gave for the directing of his Disciples, or the directing of Christians, in their performing of this Duty of Prayer.

The Doctors next quotation out of *Tertullian* is of no use to the present purpose, till it be proved that people cannot join in prayer with him who officiates, unless they do use their voices, during that performance, as audibly, as he doth his, or at least till the pretended implication of their joining voices be better cleared, than by bare assertion. But, saith the Doctor, '*Tertullian* describes some of the things, which they desired of God to bestow on the Emperors, viz. that they might have a long Life, a quiet Empire, &c. To which I answer, that this may pass for a proof of a fixed Litany, when it shall be made evident, that the particulars mentioned by *Tertullian* cannot be prayed for, but in prescribed words, or that

P 44.

an

an account cannot be given of the things which are constantly prayed for, unless those matters be constantly prayed for in the same precise words. But you may take notice that *Tertullian*, when he relates what the Christians prayed for, doth not always use the same words, nor make the same enumeration of particulars. For a proof of this I refer you to *Tertullian* himself, in the places of his Apology. The Doctor refers to, p. 44. But if you consult *Tertullian*, according to the worser Edition, which is that I am necessitated to use, you must look p. 876, and 867. As for the Doctors quotation out of *Tertullian*, *De Anima*. I need not say any thing concerning it, because Mr. *Clarkson* hath expressly answered the Plea made from that place, and the Doctor hath not thought fit to say one word to his vindication of that place. The Doctor's next quotation is out of *Tertullian De Baptismo*. Concerning which I shall only tell you, that *Tertullian* is replying to those who pretended that Baptism is not necessary, because Faith is sufficient. Now amongst other things *Tertullian* doth urge the necessity of Baptism from Christs instituting of it. *Lex enim tingendi imposita est, & forma præscripta*, saith he. And this he proves by producing what is said touching this matter in the last Chapters of St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*. What he saith amounts to this; Baptism is necessary, now under the Gospel, because the Lord Jesus hath commanded it, and told us in what manner it is to be administred. You may try your own faculty, and see whether from these premises, Christ hath instituted Baptism, and hath shewn in what manner it must be celebrated, you can draw such a conclusion as this, Therefore Prayer and Praises are to be performed in the Church by prescribed Forms, or that *Tertullian* did think so, or that

that in his days, the Church did worship God in the use of such prescribed Liturgies, as is the Subject of our present discourse. What the Dr. refers us to in *Tertul. ad ux-*
or. it only concerns singing, which is not to our present purpose. Besides, if I mistake not, it only relates to singing in the Family. The words in *Tertullian* are these; *Sonant inter duos Psalmi & Hymni, & mutuo provocant quis melius Deo suo canet.* *Tertullian* is representing some of the advantages which accrue from Christians Marrying with Christians, and this is one of them. But saith the Doctor, 'One of these Forms was the *Gloria Patri*, which he describes as *Irenæus* did by the last words, *World without end.* Now you must take notice that *Tertullian* in this last quotation is quite upon another Subject. And the quotation is out of another Book, his Discourse *de Spectaculis*. I will not stay to consider *Tertullian's* sense exactly in this place. He is dissuading the Christians from frequenting the Heathenish Games, Exercises, and Shows, and represents to them how unbecoming them it must needs be, yea how sinful to concur with them in what did ordinarily pass on those occasions. *Avertat Deus à suis tantam voluptatis exitiosæ cupiditatem. Quale est enim, de Ecclesia Dei in diaboli ecclesiam tendere? de cælo (quod aiunt) in crenum? illas manus quas ad Dominum extuleris, postmodum laudando histrionem fatigare, ex ore quo Amen in sanctum protuleris, gladiatori testimonium reddere, eis aiōvas alii omnino dicere nisi Deo Christo?* Now how come these words of *Tertullian* to be a proof of Liturgies in the Christian Church? Why the Doctor tells us we here find *eis aiōvas*; therefore there must needs be a Form, and this Form must be the *Gloria Patri*, because *eis aiōvas* is in the end of that Doxology. the Doctor had told us before that *Irenæus* had reference to the

P. 534

P. 35.

Tertu'. de
Spect. p. 700.

Gloria Patri, because he found in him *ὅς τὸς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων*; and here *Tertullian* must needs refer to the same, because in him we have nothing but *ὅς αἰῶνας*. Can *ὅς αἰῶνας* be never used but in the *Gloria Patri*? I think *Tertullian* is not minding them that this was an expression the Christians did constantly use in their publick Worship, though it might be constantly used in their publick Worship, and their Worship not be performed in prescribed Forms; but he rather intimates that this was an expression which was ordinarily used at those sights and exercises he is dissuading them from, and that it is not an expression fit for them to use with reference unto any but God and Christ. But because the Doctor doth lay such stress on this Phrase, he may consider whether the Latin Church did use the *Gloria Patri* in Greek in *Tertullians* days?

These are the passages the Doctor thought fit to alledge out of *Tertullian* for what he propounds. The other sort of passages he is concerned with, are such as Mr. *Clarkson* alledged for what he had asserted. There are two of these the Doctor doth take notice of, but saith so little concerning them, I will pass them over without saying any thing of them one way or another; for any one who considers what Mr. *Clarkson* saith with reference to them, and what the Doctor saith of them here, may easily determine whether the passages do make more for the one or for the other. But there is one passage Mr. *Clarkson* doth quote from this Author, about which the Doctor takes a great deal of pains, to shew it is capable of an interpretation which will not serve Mr. *Clarkson's* purpose. I will relate the passage, and without reflecting on the laboured constructions the Doctor hath

hath heaped together, to render it useleſs to Mr. *Clarkſons* deſign, I will plainly acquaint you with what I conceive to be the ſureſt way to find out *Tertullians* meaning. The paſſage is this; *Manibus expaſis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubeſcimus, denique, ſine monitore, quia de pectore oramus.* *Tertullian*, I apprehend, doth here give an account of the Chriſtians Prayers, that they were not ſuch as the Heathens were, but ſuch as did ſuit and agree with the advice and direction the Apoſtle had given concerning this buſineſs. His words ſeem to give an account, of what he underſtood to be the Apoſtles meaning, *1 Tim. 2. 8.* where he willeth men to Pray every where, liſting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. But the Doctor thinks the paſſage is obſcure. If ſo, then certainly *Tertullian* is fitteſt to give an account of his own meaning; and I think he doth ſo, in a very few lines after: For having ſhewed why he, and ſo all Chriſtians could not pray to any but God, he ſeems very plainly to explain in other words, the ſeveral branches of the forementioned account concerning the Chriſtians Prayers. — *Ei offero opimam & majorem hoſtiam; quàm ipſe mandavit, orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de ſpiritu ſancto proſectam.* This I take to be the true account of this controverted paſſage; whether I am in the right or not concerning it, I leave you to judge, as alſo whether this paſſage ſo underſtood, do make more for or againſt preſcribed Forms of Prayer. Theſe being the paſſages made uſe of from the Authors in the ſecond Century about Liturgies, I proceed to the

Tertul. Apol.

P. 54.

In which the first Author the Doctor doth quote is *Hippolytus*. The passage is this; *Liturgy shall be extinguished, singing of Psalms shall cease, and reading of Scripture shall not be heard.* What *Hippolytus* his meaning here is, I will not undertake to affirm positively, because I never read that Author. But as seeing the Doctor doth argue from the word *αντηρυια*, I am willing to mind you that the Doctor doth acknowledg it is but probable, that this Father meant a common Form of Prayer generally used. And I do acknowledge it would be more probable that that Father understood the word in the Doctors sense, if he had produced any proof that *αντηρυια* did either before, or in the days of this Father ever signifie a common Form of Prayer generally used in the Christian Church. Indeed I am not aware that any thing more can be warrantably concluded from this expression, than that Antichrist would suppress the publick pure Worship of God. And why Antichrist may not as well suppress the publick exercise of Ministers gifts and abilities in the Worship of God, as the use of prescribed Forms of Prayer, doth not yet occur unto me. But if Antichrist have already made any attempts against the publick Worship of God, I must needs say, I do not remember any evidence he hath given of his extraordinary dislike of Forms of Prayer, meerly as Forms. Nor do I mind any proof that hath been produced that *αντηρυια* did about the Year 220. signifie publick prescribed Forms.

P. 55.

‘Our next Author (saith the Doctor) is the Famous
‘*Origen*, in whose eleventh Homily on *Jer.* we have

‘so

'so express a Form of Prayer, which was wont to be
 'used in his days, the learned *Centuriators* were con-
 'vinced by it, that set Forms of Prayer were used in
 'his time. The matter in debate is not whether
 those learned men were convinced from that passage,
 that set Forms of Prayer were used in his time; But
 whether that passage is a substantial proof, that the
 Christian Church did in *Origen's* time worship God
 only by a prescribed Liturgy. Now the Argument
 from this Homily to prove a stated Liturgy, depends (as
Mr. Clarkson saith) on the Mode or Form of expression
 here used; and what *Origen's* way of expressing him-
 self in this place was, we have not any certainty, be-
 cause we have not his own words here, but his Tran-
 slator's, who have certified us they did not tie them-
 selves to an exact and strict translation. This argu-
 ment therefore cannot be convincing in the present
 case, because we have no assurance of the truth and
 certainty of that, on which the Argument de-
 pends, and from which it must derive its whole
 strength. The Doctor doth not take notice of this,
 but suggests it is pretended that *Ruffinus* might add this
 Prayer himself. But the doubt is not so much whe-
 ther he added the Prayer, as whether he did not
 alter the Mode of expression, and in his Translation
 put that into the Form of a Prayer, which *Origen* pro-
 pounded in another Form? For tho *Origen* might
 only relate, as *St. Paul* doth, *Ephes. 1. 16, 17.* what
 was the ordinary subject of their Petitions on such
 occasions, *Ruffinus* might in his Translation deliver
 it in the Form of a Prayer. And till we have
 some assurance that *Origen* is here faithfully transla-
 ted, and did express himself exactly in the same
 Mode the Translator reports this matter, the Ar-
 gument

gument cannot be convincing to the purpose for which it is brought. Mr. *Clarkson* further adds, 'That allow all that can be pretended fairly from 'this place, no more can be concluded from it, 'than what is common with those who do pray 'extempore, viz that they often in Prayer preferred 'one or two Petitions in the same words. To which the Doctor hath not thought fit to make any reply. If those who do officiate, do frequently use the same words in Prayer concerning the same matter, is the inference thence just, that therefore they may not use any words, or that they are bound up to a prescribed Liturgy in their whole worship? But having said thus much concerning the Dispute betwixt the Doctor and Mr. *Clarkson* touching this passage, I will relate the matter it self more distinctly. *Origin* having taken notice in the fore-mentioned Homily, that the Prophets having suffered many hardships from the People, on the account of the messages they did bring them, and the threatnings they denounced against them from the Lord, it was expedient that those who hear the word should be briefly admonished what manner of lives the Prophets did lead, and what benefits did appertain unto them, and what their own duty is, viz that if they would partake of the happiness the Prophets have arrived at, they must diligently endeavour to do the works they did. And in short, he adds, his meaning is thus; *Frequenter in Oratione dicimus, Da Omnipotens, Da nobis partem cum Prophetis, &c.* O Almighty, grant, grant unto us a part with the Prophets, grant us a part with the Apostles of thy Christ, grant that we may be found at the footsteps of thy only begotten. But (saith he) when we speak these things, we do not understand, or we have not a due sense of what these Petitions do import.

*Orig. Hom. XI.
in Jer.*

port. For in reality, when we speak thus, we do ask that God would make us to be hated as they were hated, &c. Now the matter seems very plain, viz. That *Origen* expounding the Scripture popularly, took occasion to mind the people how careful they should be, if they desired to be happy as the Prophets are, to live such lives as they did, and not content themselves with saying (as was very usual for them when they heard affectionate discourses concerning the Prophets and Apostles, &c.) Lord give us a part with them, &c. For, saith he, these Petitions or Prayers we are so prone to use when our affections are moved at the reports which are made to us concerning the Prophets, do properly signifie what we do not at all think of, or really intend, when we use those expressions. For these Prayers do really signifie our desiring of God, that we may be hated as the Prophets were, and fall into the same calamities they did endure. *Re enim hoc dicimus, fac nos sic odio haberi, ut odio habiti sunt Prophetae; — Da in istas incidere calamitates quas Apostoli sustinuerunt.* Is it any proof that he who administers Divine Ordinances is tied up to a fixed Liturgy, because in his popular discourses on particular occasions, in his pressing people to a good life, he tells them, we do ordinarily pray, O Almighty, grant us this, or that, or the other thing, and that these Petitions are of such importance as to ingage our endeavours to lead such lives as we are persuaded unto? Yea, it may be, if the matter be well inquired into, it will be found that *Origen's* explication of this Prayer, is a more just reproof of the Prayer it self, than his relating it, is a proof of the Administrators being tied up to the use of Forms in his time. For it may be very well questioned, whether Christi-

ans

ans may pray for what he saith those Petitions do properly import.

P. 58.

The next passage the Doctor doth quote out of *Origen*, is in his sixth Book against *Celsus*; And he places the force of this quotation on the Participle [προσαχθείσας] which he finds in it, and of which he gives this account, that 'it signifies not only a thing 'injoined or commanded in general, but so enjoined 'that the very order and manner of doing it, is set 'down and particularly appointed. And I may truly say that all this may be with reference unto Prayers, and yet the very words to be used, not be set down, and particularly appointed, without which there is no Liturgy in our present acceptation of that word. But, saith the Doctor, '*Origen* is speaking of the 'Prayers themselves, and gives them this Character, 'that they were ordered or prescribed, and therefore 'must be in Forms. To which I answer, that all he saith (except his inference) doth amount to no more than an order for the method of the performance, but doth not reach to the prescribing of the words. And if God have not only commanded us to pray, but hath also given Rules for the manner of performing this Duty, when we perform this Service according to the Rules he hath appointed, we may properly be said to use ταῖς προσαχθείσας τε ὡχαῖς. But if we consider the passage intirely as *Origen* hath it (for the Doctor hath left something out) it will clear it self. We do affirm for a certain truth (saith *Origen*) that they who do worship God, the Lord of all things, through Jesus in the Christian manner or way, and live according to the Gospel, using frequently, as they ought, night and day [ταῖς προσαχθείσας τε ὡχαῖς] such Prayers as are appointed or commanded, are not vanquishable, or cannot be over-

*Orig. in Cels.
lib. 6.*

come

come either by Magicians or Devils. These last words the Doctor thought fit to leave out. Now let any one judge, whether by using appointed Prayers, *Origen* meant offering up to God Prayers in such way as he had appointed, or using such prayers as were composed by Men, and saying them over in such order as they had prescribed; which of these do you imagine *Origen* thought to be the Christian's effectual security from Magicians and Devils? Can it enter into any Mans head, who knows any thing of *Origen*, that he was for Christians to use Prayers, as others did Spells? How came the use of prescribed Forms to be better security from Magicians and Devils, than any other way of praying?

There is further a Dispute betwixt the Doctor and Mr. *Clarkson*, whether *Origen*, quoting some passages which are in the Psalms, did, by saying, we find them *ἐν τῇ ψαλμῷ*, or *ἐν ταῖς ψαλμοῖς*, mean the publick Liturgy, or the Psalter? To which I shall only say, That I do not perceive that there is any Antecedent proof, that they had a publick Liturgy, but it is certain they had the Book of Psalms amongst them. I leave you to determine whether it is most probable that *Origen*, being to quote Passages which were in the Book of Psalms, would rather refer his Reader to another Book, than unto that which was acknowledged to be divinely inspired?

P. 61.

St. Cyprian is next brought by the Doctor as a Witness for Liturgies. And I might suppose, ' That he did allow ' the Lord's Prayer to be used as a Form of Prayer, and ' that he would have us repeat the very words of ' it: And yet this will not amount to any resemblance of a proof for Liturgies, as they are here to be under-

P. 65.

stood. But the Passages in *St. Cyprian* the Doctor alledgeth, do not (I think) import what he pretends they do. *St. Cyprian*, in his Sermon concerning the Lord's Prayer, seems to have the very same Notions about it, his Master *Tertullian* had expressed in his Tract concerning the same matter, of which I have spoken before. There are indeed some Passages in *St. Cyprian's* Sermon, from which the Doctor doth draw his own inferences. The enquiry must be, whether *St. Cyprian's* meaning in those passages was what the Doctor pretends?

*Cypr. Serm. de
Orat. Dom.*

St. Cyprian hath this Passage: *Orandi ipse formam dedit, ipse quid precaremur monuit & instruxit.* I conceive he means no more than this, That the Lord Jesus hath taught People in what manner they should pray, and what things they should pray for. I think if we consider *St. Cyprian's* Discourse, we cannot warrantably understand any thing else by his *Orandi forma*, than those Instructions our Saviour gave for our Direction in performing of this duty of Prayer. *St. Cyprian* doth also certifie, that the surest way to obtain acceptance and audience with the Father, is to govern our selves in the performance of this Duty by the directions the Son hath given for this purpose:

Id.

Ut dum prece & oratione quam filius docuit, apud patrem facilius audiamur. If we strictly consider this Father's sense and meaning, there doth not appear any ground to conclude that he laid any stress on our using the very words of which the Lord's Prayer doth consist. And besides several passages which might be instanced in, which do strongly intimate that what I have already mentioned, is the substance of this Father's meaning here, there is one short

short Passage, at a little distance from these already mentioned, which, to me, seems to put the matter out of all doubt : *Ut aliter orare quàm docuit, non ignorantia sola sit, sed & culpa.* Now let any man, who knows any thing at all of St. Cyprian, judge whether he thought that it was a sin to use any other words in Prayer, than just those which were expressed in the Lord's Prayer ; and whether his meaning was not, that it is a sin or fault to govern our selves in the performing of this duty, by other Instructions, than those the Son had given for our guidance in this Duty ? This I take to be the meaning of that other Passage, *Agnoscat pater filii sui verba, cum precem facimus.* By *verba filii sui*, I conceive is not meant the words of the Lord's Prayer, but the Instructions and Directions the Son gave for the right performing of this duty. Here I may mind you, that the Doctor in his Discourse on one of his Quotations out of Origen, hath this Passage : ' Note also Origen doth not say, the ' Christian made these enjoyned Prayers, but used ' them ; which supposes they were made into a prescribed Form before. Now what doth the Doctor think might be noted here (according to his way of making notes) upon *precem facimus* ? But for my part I think the Ancients, by making Prayers, and by using Prayers, meant much what the same thing, viz. performing the duty of Prayer. Moreover, St. Cyprian hath this Expression, *Si petamus ipsius oratione* ; And this he immediately interprets (I think) by our governing our selves in this Duty by the Directions he had laid down about it. And his account of these Directions is very like that Tertullian had given of them before him : *Sit autem orantibus sermo*

Id.

P. 60.

Id.

& precatio cum disciplina, quietem continens, & pudorem. There are two Passages more relating to this matter, which the Doctor quotes out of this Author, in which he considers the words the Author useth, but neglects the sense and meaning the Author had, in his using of those words. The first is this, *Publica est nobis & communis oratio.* Now St. Cyprian's meaning is neither more nor less than this; That Christians must not be so confined and narrow-spirited, in their Prayers, as to pray only for themselves, but they must extend their Prayers to others, and pray for all People. He does not call the Christians Prayer *publick and common*, because he speaks of the Lord's Prayer, as the Doctor pretends, nor as intimating that there was one fixed prescribed form, which all were to use, but because their prayers were not to be confined to themselves, but to be general or universal extending to all Men. That this is the plain and obvious sense of this place, I appeal to any one, who will consider what goes a little before, and what immediately follows these words, *Ante omnia pacis doctor, atque unitatis magister singulatim noluit & privatim precem fieri, ut quis cum precatur, pro se tantum precetur*——*publica est nobis, & communis oratio, & quum oramus, non pro uno, sed pro populo toto oramus.* This is also the plain meaning of his next Quotation, as you will easily perceive when you see the sentence entire which is thus; *Unusquisque oret dominum non pro se tantum, sed & pro omnibus fratribus, sicut Dominus Jesus orare nos docuit, ubi non singulis privatam precem mandavit, sed communi & concordi prece orare pro omnibus jussit.*

Cypr. Ep. ad
Cler. Gc.

The Doctor saith there are still more evident Proofs in this Author, not only of Forms, but of a Liturgy. And his first Instance is out of the fore-mentioned Sermon concerning the Lord's Prayer. I forbear a great many Reflections I might easily make on what the Doctor saith concerning this Passage; I will only mind you, that a *Common Prayer* in the present sense of that Phrase, must be proved to be in *St. Cyprian's* time, before it can be owned that he cited *Sursum Corda*, out of that *Common Prayer*. And notwithstanding this Phrase is to be found in Liturgies framed long after *St. Cyprian's* time, it doth not appear there was any such Liturgy then; nor does *St. Cyprian* say a word here of this Phrase being used in the Eucharist, though Liturgies since framed, have inserted it in that Office. Now the whole *St. Cyprian* saith about this matter amounts but to this; He having exhorted the People to keep their minds and hearts very intent upon what should be their business when they are offering up their Prayers unto God; he explains to them the design of an Exhortation the Priest did usually give them, before he began his prayer. *Ideo & sacerdos* Cypr. de Or. m. Dom.
ante orationem præfatione præmissa, parat fratrum mentes dicendo, Sursum corda, ut dum respondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, admoneatur nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere. And from hence he inforces on them his former Instruction or Exhortation. Now if a Minister cannot pray but in a prescribed Form, after that he hath desired the People to lift up their hearts to God, and they have declared their readiness to concur with him therein, this may pass for a proof of prescribed Liturgies. The present business

is.

is not to enquire what inferences others have made from this Passage, but whether a prescribed Liturgy be deduceable from a Ministers desiring the People before he begins to pray, to lift up their hearts to God, and attend to what should be the main business of Prayer, or from their answering that they are ready and willing to concur with him in what he desires of them?

P. 67.

Here appearing so little evidence for Liturgies in this Passage, I proceed to the Doctor's next more evident proof for a Liturgy out of this Author. 'We may observe (saith the Doctor) not only by this Preface, but also by another Passage that the *African* Church and the *Eastern* did hugely agree in these Liturgick Forms, because, as the *Greeks* say, 'Give holy things to those that are Holy. So it seems they did at *Carthage*, where (as *St. Cyprian* notes) they were daily charged to keep that which was Holy in a pure Conscience, according to our Lord's Command, not to cast that which is Holy to Dogs, that is, in the Eucharist (which they then daily celebrated) they used that Phrase, Give Holy things to Holy Persons. Now the truth, with reference to this passage, is this; *St. Cyprian*, in the beginning of his Discourse against *Demetrian*, acquaints him why he had so long chosen rather to keep silence, than to make a formal answer to his Calumnies and Railery; And for his warrant in doing thus, he quotes some places of Scripture, and immediately inserts these words; *Et Sanctum quoque jubeamur intra conscientiam nostram tenere, nec conculcandum porcis & canibus exponere*: For the proof of which command or charge, he refers, not to their Communion Service, or their Office

Cyp. ad Demet.

Office at the Eucharist, (as the Doctor hints) but to a Passage of our Saviour's, as it is laid down expressly in the Gospel: *Loquente Domino, & dicente, ne dederitis sanctum canibus, neque miseritis margaritas vestras ante porcos, &c.* In this same Tract the Doctor pretends to find a Christian Litany; he refers to the same page he had quoted for the former Passage, but you will find the Passage he speaks of, towards the latter end of this Tract. Here St. Cyprian saith, That notwithstanding Christians can rejoyce in every Condition, and patiently bear the most adverse occurrences, because of the respect they have unto the happy and blessed Estate which is to come; yet they do as occasion requires offer up their Prayers to God for temporal blessings, and the removing or moderating of Adversities, &c.

P. 68.

Et tamen pro arcendis hostibus, & imbris impetrandis, & vel auferendis vel temperandis adversis rogamus semper, & preces fundimus, &c. Now

Cypr. Cont.
Demet.

because St. Cyprian and Tertullian do give an account of some things which were the subject matter of the Christians constant or occasional Petitions, (for I suppose the Doctor doth hardly think the Christians did every day pray for the procuring of Rain) therefore the Doctor concludes they had a Liturgy; And because the particulars mentioned, were prayed for in the Ancient Litanies, (though much younger than either of these two Authors) therefore in the times of these Authors, they had a certain Form, though they concealed the phrases of it from unbelievers. If any Man can see any strength in this way of arguing, before it be proved that these things cannot

be

be prayed for but in prescribed words, I must acknowledge he can see farther than I can.

P. 69.

The Doctor having produced these Testimonies from *St. Cyprian*, to evidence a Liturgy in his days, applies himself to answer some Passages *Mr. Clarkson* had offered from this Author, to prove that in his days, those who did officiate were at liberty to express themselves in their Prayers as they thought most convenient. The first Quotation for this purpose is out of *St. Cyprian's* Epistle to Pope *Lucius*, where he gives him an account of their praying to God for him suitably to the present occasion which was offered them. This occasion of offering up their prayers for him was particular, and such as was not incident every day. The Question now is this, Whether seeing they did pray for him with a particular regard to what is related in that Epistle, the Petitions they offered up were prescribed, or whether they were expressed freely according as the occasion required? I shall leave the indifferent Reader, when he peruseth what the Doctor hath said about this matter, to conclude as he shall see fit, whether the Doctor hath cleared this Passage to his satisfaction. For I think the Question is not, whether those words he relates there, were the very words they constantly used on that occasion; but whether there was a Prayer ready prescribed for that occasion? If there were not, and they did ordinarily pray for the things mentioned without being confined to use the same words every time, do you judge whether this Passage do make more for the Doctor or *Mr. Clarkson*. It is in my judgment, but a poor answer for the Doctor to insinuate,

insinuate, that a Primate may occasionally pray without a prescribed Form, but inferiour Priests may not, unless Ministerial abilities are not to be exercised proportionably to the measure in which God hath conferred the same, but accordingly as those who have them can climb up towards the top of Ecclesiastical Dignity and Pre-ferment. P. 70.

His second Allegation (saith the Doctor) out of St. *Cyprian* for such occasional Prayers is, that there are also mention of such occasional Prayers in the Epistle to *Moses* and *Maximus*; but he durst not (saith the Doctor) cite the place at large, which only speaks of private Prayers made by these Confessors in prison, &c. Now because the Doctor hath such a mind to have the place cited at large, I will do it, and then leave you to judge whether it only speaks of private Prayers, or whether the Passage do speak at all of the Prayers of these Confessors? Mr. *Clarkson* refers to the particular Epistle, and the words are these, *Et nos quidem vestri, diebus ac noctibus, memores, & quando in sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus, & cum in secessu privatis precibus oramus, coronis ac laudibus vestris plenam domini faventiam poscimus.* P. 71.

Cypr. epist.
ad Mos. &
Maxim.

There is one instance more, the Doctor takes notice of, and seems to be in some passion with Mr. *Clarkson* about it. Now the matter stands thus; Mr. *Clarkson* in one part of his Book is shewing that the Ancients were not so wedded to particular words and phrases, as some have been in latter years. And to give some proof of this, he

H

doth

doth shew amongst other instances, that they did not conceive Christ had so tied them up in the Administration of Baptism, that they must necessarily use just those very words he had set down relating to this matter in the Gospel; but that they had leave to vary their expressions, and change those words related in the Gospel for others, provided they did not change the sense. He shews they did ordinarily vary in several particulars, and amongst the rest he saith some thought themselves not obliged to Baptise expressly, in the name of the Sacred Trinity, so as to name every person, as they are mentioned *Mat. 28. 19.* but in the name of Christ, or of the Lord Jesus, or of the Lord. He farther adds, and this supposed to be the practice of the best times, hath great Advocates. He names several, who are, and were far enough from being lookt upon as Hereticks. Afterwards he quotes this very Passage in *St. Cyprian*, which creates the Doctor so much disturbance. The Doctor seems to be displeased because *Mr. Clarkson* did not quote the Passage entire, without leaving out any words; and then tells us *St. Cyprians* words are these: 'How then do some say, who are out of the Church, yea against the Church, that if a Pagan be any where, or any way Baptised in the name of Christ Jesus, he may obtain the Remission of Sins? And hereupon the Doctor falls into a warm sort of short talk about Hereticks and Schismatics. Now *St. Cyprians* words are these;

gen.

*Cypr. ad.
Jubai.*

Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt, foris extra ecclesiam, modo in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunq; & quomodocunq;

gentilem Baptizatum Remissionem peccatorum consequi posse? I will not dispute whether the Doctor hath translated this Passage as it ought to be translated, though I do not know any necessity that there is, that *foris extra ecclesiam*, must be used as explanatory of *quidam*. But all that Mr. *Clarkson* brought this Passage for, was to prove that some in St. *Cyprians* days were of the above mentioned opinion. And I think the quotation is full to that point. He did not produce this place to prove they were Orthodox in St. *Cyprians* Judgement, but he doth expressly declare St. *Cyprian* did not allow it; yet I am not sensible that it doth follow they were either Hereticks or Schismaticks, because *foris extra ecclesiam*, is in this sentence.

The Doctors next proof for Liturgies is from the account St. *Basil* gives concerning *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, 'who was so much for a Liturgy that we have the testimony of St. *Basil* (saith the Doctor) 'concerning him, that he appointed a Form of Prayer for that Church of *Næocesarea*, from which they would not vary in one Ceremony, or in a Word; nor would they add one mystical Form to those which he had left them. Now the Case was thus. St. *Basil* was proving the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, from the Ancients Ascribing Glory and Power to the Father, and the Son, with the Holy Spirit. And having named several of the Ancients who had taught that Glory and Power were to be Ascribed to the Spirit, as well as to the Father, and the Son, he at last mentions *Gregory* the Great, and proves that he was of the

P. 72.

Basil. de Spir. sancto. cap. 29.

P. 73.

same mind, from the present practice of that Church. And to make it appear they had not varied from the Doctrine of that great man, he reports the profound respect the people of that Country still had for him. So that [*ἡ πρῆξις*, &c. as the Doctor relates in his Margin] they would not add any Practice, any Word, or any mystical Form in the Church to what he had left with them. By which I conceive he means, that they did strictly observe that way and method for their ordinary Worship, and kept strictly to those Doctrines, and that way of Administering the Sacrament which were in use in *Gregory's* time. *But he doth not say one word of Gregory's appointing a Form of Prayer for that Church.* Nor does it follow that because they Worshiped God in the same manner, a great many years after *Gregory*, wherein they worshipped him in his time, that therefore they used the very words he used. Whereas, it is said they did not add a word to what he left with them, that doth not relate to their Prayers, but to the Doctrine he taught; for here *St. Basil* is speaking of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and proving that Doctrine. And in other places *St. Basil* takes notice how tenacious they were of the Words in which *Gregory* did deliver the Doctrines of Christianity unto them, particularly to prove his own Doctrine to be the same with what *Gregory* did teach, he alledged his having learned from *Macrina* the Doctrines of Faith in the very words wherein *Gregory* had delivered them. If it shall be said he is here proving the Divinity of the Holy

Epist. 75.

Holy Spirit by a part of their Worship, viz. their ascribing Glory and Power to God, what can be inferred from thence is but this; That *Gregory* had taught them when they did ascribe Glory and Power to the Father and Son, to add also, *With the Holy Spirit*. *St. Basil* farther adds, They were so tenacious of what *Gregory* had taught and practised amongst them, they would not depart from that simplicity in the Celebrating of the Worship of God, which he observed, though a more Pompous and Ceremonious way did prevail in other Churches, and which some thought did better suit with the alteration of their circumstances. But here you may take notice that *St. Basil* doth not alledge any Liturgy, *Gregory* had composed for them, but only pleads the present usage of that Church, and argues it was the same in *Gregories* days, not because they had a Liturgy of his Composing, but because their respect to him all along to the present time was such, they would not suffer any addition to be made, to the method or order he observed, or to the Doctrines he had taught. To me it appears plain, that there was not any Liturgy of *Gregories* Composing, *St. Basil* could produce for his present purpose; but finding something in the use of that Church which was pertinent to his business, he alledges that, and the better to inforce that allegation, he urges the great probability there was that they received it from him; and to put the more colour upon this, he breaks forth into a Rhetorical *Encomium* on that Father, and the great respect the people of that

Coun-

P. 73.

Basil Epist.
63. ad Cler.
Næoces.

Country had for him. So that the sentence the Doctor quotes, only entertains us with an Hyperbolical account of the respect the people had for *Gregory*. For *St. Basil* himself doth speak much otherwise of this matter when it comes in his way upon a different occasion. And particularly in that very Epistle the Doctor refers us to, in the next place, for a proof 'that this *Gregory* had appointed that Church a particular way of singing the Psalms, of which the *Næocesarean* Clergy were so extremely tenacious, that 'when *St. Basil* would have brought in a better way, they opposed him in it, and objected that 'it was not so in the days of *Gregory* the Great. 'Tis true, it was objected against that way of singing *St. Basil* would have introduced, that it was not in use there, in the time of *Gregory*. But if you consider the Answer *St. Basil* makes to this Objection, you will find him giving an account of the *Næocesareans* very different from that we have in his Book *de Spiritu Sancto*. Amongst other things which he saith, he peremptorily enquires *By what Testimonies will they make it evident, that those things which he recommends to them, were not in use in the time of Gregory?* Now assuredly this was a very strange sort of question, if he knew they had a *Liturgy* of *Gregory's* Composing, which they constantly made use of. Or if they had but an *Order* of his framing, which they were strictly to observe in the several parts of their Worship. Yea, he tells them to whom he Writes, that they had not preserved any of those instances then used pure and uncorrupt unto that time.

More-

moreover he very plainly intimates, that there was no way to make a true judgment of what *Gregory* did, but by consulting the Holy Scriptures. When he mentions several particulars, which he affirms concerning *Gregory*, he doth not quote his Liturgy, his Rubrick, &c. but express words of Scripture: particularly he saith, That *Gregory Prayed with his Head uncovered*. Now how doth he prove this? Not from any order *Gregory* had made concerning this matter, but because the Apostle had said, *Every man Praying or Prophecying, with his Head covered, dishonoureth his Head*; And *Gregory* (saith he) was a genuine Disciple of the Apostles. Thus you have an account of those two Passages the Doctor doth quote out of *St. Basil*. And you may now judge whether it be possible to have a clearer proof in the World for Prescribed Forms than this; And whether the Doctor had any occasion given him from these Allegations, to break forth into such a Vaunting Discourse as he entertains his Reader with, upon his having produced these quotations?

As for what the Doctor quotes out of *Eusebius* concerning *Paulus Samosatenus*; It only concerns Hymns; and I am not sensible that the way of arguing is cogent, That because people do sing Hymns composed to their hands, therefore they do or must necessarily pray by prescribed Forms. One might think the *Precentor of York* should understand the difference there is, betwixt praying, and singing, if any knowledge of the nature, and use of singing, of framing the voice into a regular, melodious, tunable sound, in order to the raising

raising of the affections, be at all necessary to that *Character*. And a due consideration of that, might have prevented a great many tautologies which are to be found in his Scholastical History, and would have made his Discourse much shorter than it is, though it must have deprived the Reader of many of those flights (which it may be) the Doctor conceits are very graceful. But if you have a mind to peruse the Passage (the Doctor speaks of) in *Eusebius*, if you consult *Valesius* his Edition, you must not look for it where the Doctor's Margin directs, but in *lib. 7. cap. 30.*

P. 76.

*Euseb. Hist. Ec-
cles. lib. 6. cap.
35. p. 180.*

'I shall add no more (saith the Doctor) in
'this *Century*, but to observe, that in the Epi-
'sle of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, recorded by *Eusebius*, it appears to have been the general usage
'of the Church, for every one of the People to
'say *Amen*, when they heard the Priest offer
'them the Sacrament, and say, The Body of our
'Lord Jesus Christ, &c. which was a Form so uni-
'versally used in all Churches of the world, that
'we may conclude it was enjoyed by all *Liturgies*.
What Edition of *Eusebius* the Doctor made use
of, I do not know. But his Margin gives me no
assistance for the finding of the place he speaks
of. The *Form*, the Doctor saith, was so uni-
versally used, I suppose is these words, *The Bo-
dy of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.* Now I do not
remember that *Eusebius* doth any where in his
Sixth Book report, either from *Dionysius*, or any
other, that those words were universally used on
the occasion the Doctor mentions. But there is
a Passage

a passage in his Sixth Book which hath something of what the Doctor mentions; whether that be the place the Doctor means, I know not. I will give you the English of it, and refer you to the Author, to see whether you can find any thing there for the Doctor's purpose. *Eusebius* saith that *Cornelius* relates to *Fabius* the worst of all the wickednesses which *Novatus* was guilty of, which was this. When he hath consecrated the Elements, dividing unto every one a Portion, and giving it unto him, he compels those wretched persons to swear instead of giving thanks, for catching the hands of him who receiveth, within both his hands, he doth not loose them till he hath sworn in this manner (for I will report his words) Swear to me by the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wilt never forsake me, and turn to *Cornelius*. And the miserable man doth not taste of the Elements, till he hath first pronounced a Curse upon himself; and when he receives that Bread, instead of saying, Amen, He saith I will not return to *Cornelius*. If this be the passage the Doctor means, here is nothing said of the peoples hearing the Priest say these particular words, The Body of our Lord Jesus, &c. Besides, this passage is not in *Dionysius* his Epistle, but in *Cornelius* his Epistle to *Fabius*. But yet there is in *Eusebius*'s Seventh Book an Epistle of *Dionysius*, which hath something in it that hath some resemblance to some part of that the Doctor relates; I will give you an account of that, and then I have done with the Doctors quotations for this Century. *Dionysius* in his Epistle

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. cap. 43 p. 245.

*Euseb. Hist. Ec-
cles. lib. 7. cap.
9. p. 255.*

He to *Xyflus*, Bishop of *Rome*, relates how one who had been esteemed, or reckoned a great while for one of the Faithful, upon his observing how Baptism was celebrated amongst the Orthodox, was in very great trouble, because having been Baptised amongst the Hereticks, his Baptism was not the same, nor had not any thing common with the Baptism of the Orthodox; And therefore he was very desirous to be Baptised again. *Dionysius* durst not do it, but told him, that his long continued Communion with the Church was sufficient. *For I may not Baptise him again, who hath often heard the Praises which are offered unto God, and hath answered with the rest, Amen; who hath stood at the Table, and hath stretched forth his hands to take the Sacred Food, and hath received the same, and hath for a convenient time been partaker of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.* If this be the passage the Doctor means, you will easily perceive, that he gives not a fair account of it, and that it is not at all for his purpose. I do not see how a prescribed Liturgy can be inferred from either of these passages related out of *Eusebius*, no nor (supposing good evidence that the Priest did constantly use these words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.* in distributing and giving the Bread unto the people) how we can justly conclude there was a prescribed Liturgy, from the words of which, the Priest must never vary in any of his Prayers and Praises in Publick?

Sir,

Sir, I think I have now given you a true account of all those passages the Doctor hath produced out of the Ancients, for Liturgies, in the three First Centuries. It is easie for any man, who lays aside prejudice, and will form a judgment of matters only in proportion to the evidence which is offered for them, to determine whether His Quotations be a solid proof of that for which he produceth them.

I have confined my self to what the Doctor alledgeth for Liturgies in the three First Centuries, because I think this pretended Antiquity of Liturgies is designed, not to justify their *lawfulness* (and would we content our selves with that, and effectually prove their expediency, the breach betwixt us, and the greatest part of our Fellow-Protestants relating to this matter, would soon be made up) but to introduce, or support an Opinion of their *Necessity* in the *Christian Church*. And I conceive the three First Centuries, is a period of sufficient extent for an enquiry, concerning a matter so circumstanced. The *lawfulness* of Liturgies may be argued from more Rational Topicks, than Humane Authority. Their *Expediency* must be judged of, upon a just weighing of circumstances; Their *Necessity* cannot be proved by any Topick.

Those who attempt to advance the Necessity of Liturgies, do not only oppose them, who were wont to be called Dissenters, but are apparently managing a Design against the most Learned, Judicious, and Moderate, who are in the Communion of the *Church of England*: And therefore

fore it may be proper enough, for one of the Church of *England* to mind such Persons, That to catch up some words and Phrases, which are to be found in the Writings of the Ancient Fathers in the Christian Church, leaving their sense behind, and then tacking them together in Discourses about Liturgies, will no more prove Liturgies to be as Ancient as they pretend, than the Artificial Fastning of a *Long Gray-Beard* to a Youth's *Chin*, will prove him to be a very Old Man.

Sir, With reference to the following Part of the Doctor's Book, I shall only tell you at present, That I take it to be of a *Piece* with that Part I have already considered. And if you are desirous to have a more distinct account of the Greatest Part of his more Numerous Quotations in the Fourth Century, you need not give yourself any further trouble, than to signify your pleasure to

Your Most Affectionate Friend,

and Faithful Servant, &c.

THE END.

A SECOND
EXAMINATION

OF

Doctor COMBER's
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

Primitive and General Use

OF

LITURGIES

IN THE

Christian Church,

During the greatest part of the Fourth CENTURY.

By S. B.

*So vain is a dispute from an uncertain sound of words, which have
a general unlimited Sense, since 'tis against all the Rules of Reason
to fix a particular meaning on those Expressions, which are delivered
in general terms; and so may be understood many ways.
Transubstantiation, a peculiar Article of Roman Catholick Faith,
See, in Answer to a late Discourse called Reasons for Abrogating
the Test, pag. 17.*

LONDON,

Printed for Richard Janeway in Queen's-Head Alley in Peter
Noster-Row, 1691.

EXAMINATION

Doct. C. O. M. & R.

SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

Primitive and General Use

LITURGIES

OF THE

Church of England

A N
EXAMINATION
O F
Dr. COMBER's Testimonies
F O R
LITURGIES
(In the Fourth Century, &c.)

S I R,

I Shall wave all Ceremonious Address, and immediately apply my self to what is to be my business in this Letter ; viz. To give you a true Account (according to the best of my Judgment) of the greatest part of those numerous Quotations Dr. *Comber* hath produced from Ancient Fathers, to prove that the only way of the Christian Publick Worship, was by the Use of prescribed Liturgies

In the Fourth Century.

The Doctor, near the beginning of his Discourse about this Century, doth certifie, " That if we had
B " no

P. 77.

" no Evidence of settled Forms of Prayer before
 " this Age, it had been enough to justify our Use
 " of them, to shew we have Presidents for it from
 " this Age. Here (I think) the Doctor should
 have explained himself a little, and should have
 told us, what he understands by *our Use of them*.
 Or if he allows Mr. *Clarkson's* stating of the Point,
 he should have taken care to have produced good
 Proof of *such use* of them in this Age. For if his
 Quotations do not reach such use of Liturgies,
 (though they might justify our use of them) they
 will not at all affect Mr. *Clarkson*, on whom the
 Doctor doth all along bestow this Epithet, *My Adver-*
sary. Before the Doctor begins with his Quotations
 for this Century, he lays down two Reasons why
 this Age is early enough to justify our Use of Litur-
 gies. His first Reason is this, " Because this is the
 " first Century wherein the miraculous Gifts were
 " ceased. Now if the Doctor by *miraculous Gifts*,
 do mean miraculous Gifts of Prayer, he should first
 have proved there were such Gifts formerly, before
 he had alledged the ceasing of them, as a Justification
 of Liturgies. And he hath not one Author in the
 preceding Centuries which saith any thing of such
 miraculous Gifts. And he can alledge but one Au-
 thor (that I know of) in the after Ages of Anti-
 quity, who had imbibed the Notion of an extra-
 ordinary Gift of Prayer in the Primitive Church.
 As for other miraculous Gifts, the continuance, or the
 ceasing of them, have nothing to do with this present
 business. But if there were such miraculous Gifts of
 Prayer (as the Doctor speaks of) till this Century,
 and these did supersede the Use of Liturgies in the
 Christian Church till this Century, then all his former
 Quota-

Ibidem.

Quotations for Liturgies are not only Impertinent, but a confident pretence of Proof in direct Contradiction to his own *Notion*. If there were such miraculous Gifts, and yet they did not supersede the Use of Liturgies, then the ceasing of those Gifts cannot be a very weighty Reason why this Age should be early enough to justify such Use of Liturgies, as is at present in debate. The Doctor's second Reason is, "This was the first Century wherein the Church
 P. 77.
 "was settled under Christian Magistrates. Now this is certain, when Magistrates were Christians, the Church had more freedom and liberty for Worship, than they had before, But I do not understand why this should justify the Officers of the Church in a total neglect to exercise their own Abilities; or indeed in exercising their own Abilities less in Prayer and Praise, than they did before. I cannot perceive how this will justify the offering up of Prayers to God in Christian Assemblies, in another manner than was formerly used. If Liturgies were not used in Christian Assemblies formerly, how will the bare having Christian Magistrates justify the Use of them afterwards? Indeed if worshipping God in the sole Use of prescribed Liturgies, be a better and more pure way of worshipping God, than that the Church used before; and the Church gained this Privilege and Advantage by their enjoying Christian Magistrates, then the Doctor will have some colour for his way of reasoning. But if it should prove at last, that the sole Use of prescribed Liturgies is not a way of Worship so pleasing to God, as that the Church used when in outward circumstances which were less prosperous; then supposing such Use of Liturgies in this Century, this Reason of the

Doctor's will not justify it. Having said thus much to the Doctor's Reasons, I will now consider the Quotations he doth produce out of the Ancients, to prove the fore-mentioned Use of Liturgies in this Century.

Arnobius is the first Author of this Century which the Doctor quotes. " In whom (saith the Doctor) " there are some Intimations of the Use of Forms. This may be supposed, without any detriment to that part of the Question, the Doctor doth combat. To be short, I will relate *Arnobius's* words, from which the Doctor concludes he hath these Intimations of the Use of Forms; and then you may judge whether the Use of Forms of Prayer can be drawn from what *Arnobius* doth say, without a great deal of violence. *Arnobius*, in his First Book, doth vindicate the Christians from what the Heathens did lay to their charge, and pretended was a just ground for their treating the Christians so cruelly as they did; viz That the Christians were the causes why the Gods did inflict Calamities and Judgments upon them; and that the Gods did afflict them, to engage and excite them to punish and take vengeance on the Christians, who were so offensive to them. *Arnobius* enquires particularly of them, what the Reason should be, that the Gods should be so offended at the Christians? And he brings in the Heathens giving this Answer, *Reli-*

giones iniquunt impias, atque inauditos cultus terrarum
Gent. l. 1. p. 470. orbe tractatis. Upon this *Arnobius* expostulates with
My Arnob. adv. them, and particularly in these words: *Deum principem*
Gent. is joyned *rerum cunctarum quaecunque sunt, Dominum summitatem*
to the Com- *omnium summorum obtinentem adorare, obsequio venera-*
mentary on the
Psalms, there-
fore I refer to
 the Pages as they are markt in my Book, and not as I should have done, If I had had
Arnob. adv, Gent. by itself.

*bili invocare, in rebus fessis, totis ut ita dixerim sensibus
 amplectari, amare, suspicere, execrabilis religio est, &
 infausta, impietatis & sacrilegii plena, caeremonias anti-
 quitus institutas novitatis suae superstitione contaminans?*

Now what is there in these words, that can possibly intimate a Use of Forms of Prayer? Will any Man undertake to prove that *obsequium venerabile*, was Latin in those days for a *prescribed Liturgy*? *Arnobius* doth afterwards say, That whosoever doth condemn the Christians on this account, deserves neither to be reckoned a God, nor a Man: And whereas they might pretend, That they were certified by their Oracle, that the Christians were Ungodly; he tells them, That he who delivered their Oracles, was not fit to be reputed a God, because of his ignorance concerning the Christians, and their Worship; which he might have knowledge of, if he had any sense.

Delius Apollo, vel Clarius Didymeus, Philesius, Pythius, & is habendus divinus est? qui aut summum imperatorem nescit, aut ignorat à nobis quotidianis ei precibus supplicari, qui si pectorum secreta nesciret, nec quid in intimis sensibus contineamus, agnosceret, summum tamen invocare nos Deum, & eo ab quod postulamus orare, vel auribus potuit scire, vel ipsius vocis sono qua utimur in precibus noscitare.

Now who could imagin this passage should be alledged for a Proof of Liturgies, unless it had been first evidenced that People cannot Pray, or not Pray daily, or not use their voice in Prayer, but by the Use of prescribed Forms? *Arnobius* also, because he had not time to treat particularly of all those who were the Christian's Enemies, &c. resolved to lay down a general Account what sort of People Christians were; which he doth in these words: *Nihil sumus aliud Christiani, nisi Magistro Christo, summi regis*

P. 471.

P. 472.

ac.

ac principis veneratores : nihil, si consideres, aliud invenies in ista religione versari. Hæc totius summa est actionis, hic propositus terminus divinorum officiorum, hic finis, huic omnes ex more prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus, ab hoc justa, & honesta, & auditu ejus condigna deprecimur. Do you judge now whether this Account do not agree to all Orthodox Christians, though they do not bind themselves to the Use of a prescribed Liturgy. I have set down all these Passages at large, that you may consider them just as they are in *Arnobius* : For the Doctor did not think fit to report them intirely, nor to give any account of the Occasion on which *Arnobius* did make use of the Phrases he insists on, nor in what manner *Arnobius* doth express himself ; but only picks up some single Phrases scattered in these Passages, and from his own jumbling of them altogether, he concludes, *Their Prayers could be no other than stated Forms known before to the Congregation.* And the Doctor immediately adds, " Unless the Ministers and People had used such Forms, *Arnobius* could not be sure they should always ask things fit for God's holy Ears. Now *Arnobius* is speaking of all Christians in general, and does only declare what their Duty is, by virtue of that Religion they do profess. Besides, *Arnobius* could not be sure Christians would always ask things fit for God's holy Ears in the Use of Liturgies, unless all the Liturgies which should ever be used, had been brought under his particular Inspection. And some Liturgies, we are very certain, have been used, which have had such things in them, as no good Protestant will undertake to justify, and prove were fit for God's holy Ears. The Doctor saith further, " That *Arnobius*, in another place evidently points to that Li-
" tany

Pag. 79.

Ibidem.

“ tany which *Tertullian* had briefly described in his “ Apology. But I think there is no prescribed Litany to be found in *Tertullian's* Apology. And how evidently soever *Arnobius* doth point at that Litany, I am sure he says not any one word that imports a prescribed Litany, nor doth he say one word of *Tertullian*; and if he had any thought of such a Litany, it is certain his Account of it is not the same with *Tertullian's*. *Arnobius*, in the place where the Doctor thinks he has a prescribed Litany referr'd to, is expostulating with the Heathens about their rude pulling down the places where the Christians had their Assemblies for the Worship of God. His words are these: *Cur immaniter Conventicula dirui? in quibus summus oratur Deus. pax cunctis & venia postulatur, magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, &c.* Here you may take notice, that as *Arnobius*, and other of the Ancient Writers do declare, the Christians did pray for these and the like Persons and Things in their Assemblies; so neither he, nor any of the Fathers before him, do ever say the Christians did constantly pray for these Persons and Things in the same words, which is necessary to a Liturgy in the present sense of that word. And though *Arnobius*, and other Fathers had no design to quote the words of their Litany, (as the Doctor saith) yet they might have certified, that the words were prescribed, and that they had Forms, which they were obliged to use without variation, if the Case were so in their days. And their having never told the World that it was thus in their days, leaves us without Evidence that Liturgies were then in use.

The Doctor's next Authority for Liturgies, is what *Eusebius* reports concerning *Constantine the Great*. He saith

Arnob. adv. Gent. lib. 4. pag. 624.

P. 80.

Euseb. vii.
Constant. lib. 4.
cap. 7.

saith that *Constantine* ordered his Palace or Family after the manner of the Church of God. And he gives two Instances of this, viz. the reading of the Holy Scriptures in his Family, and afterwards performing *εὐχαῖς ὑπόθεσις*, which the Doctor translates, *prescribed Prayers*. If he means, Prayers composed to his hands, and consisting of prescribed words which must not by any means be varied, I think he will not easily prove that to be the sense of this Expression here; and if he prove not that, the Quotation will not serve his turn. I think the Phrase doth only note *lawful Prayers*, or *Prayers which are agreeable to the Laws which concern the Duty of Prayer*. This is the Phrase *Eusebius* doth use in the other passages the Doctor doth alledge from him. And if *Eusebius* may be allowed to understand his own meaning, and to interpret himself, I think it will evidently appear that he did not mean *Humane Laws* relating to this Duty, but *Divine Laws*. What the Doctor further adds in the same Page, relates only to Heathen Soldiers; and if he composed a Form of Prayer for them, and obliged them to recite it (as he reports) every Sunday, what is that to a Liturgy in the Christian Church? But I do not perceive that the Soldiers were obliged to repeat those very words of which his Prayer did consist. He made them a Prayer which *Eusebius* reports (cap. 20.) which (I think) they might use as a Prayer, or as a Pattern for Prayer: For *Eusebius* saith,

Id. Cap. 20.

Καὶ ταύτας ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς ὡραῖς διδόν εὐχαῖς ἀπέναι φωνῆς:
And he taught them to utter such words in their Prayers to God. But saith the Doctor, " he commends the

Ibidem.

" Emperor, because he was a Teacher of the words of Prayer. I do acknowledge, he doth commend the Emperor, because he was *ἀγαθὸν οὐκ ἐπὶ διδασκαλῆς*,

Euseb. de laud.
Const. p. 628.

a Teacher of such words as were proper to be used in Prayer. But these Prayers, take them in the Doctor's sense, were made for *Heathen Soldiers* who had not yet entertained the Christian Doctrine; and what is this to the Prayers which are to be performed in publick by the *Officers of the Church*? Now here we may learn what *Eusebius* doth mean by *ἡρώδης ἐκδιδόναι*. The Prayers he made for his Soldiers are (*Vit. Constant.*) called by this Title, as well as those Prayers which were performed in his Family; and here he explains himself, *διεμαρτε ἀπολυθῆναι δεῖναι*, such as were agreeable to the *Divine Laws*. So that *Constantine's* Palace resembled the Church of God, amongst other things, in this, that such Prayers were performed there as were agreeable unto the Laws of God. And from hence we may gather, that such Prayers were offered up to God in the Church, as he had appointed in his Word. But how this should prove they were prescribed Forms, is *too dark a Mystery* for me to comprehend or see into, till it shall be proved, that no Prayers can be such as God doth appoint, but prescribed Forms. And I think it is *too late* in the day to convince *Protestants* of that by Authors who lived in the *Fourth Century*.

The Great *Athanasius* is the Doctor's next Author, in whom he finds an Instance of the Peoples making *Vocal Responses*, when, upon a particular Occasion, they were exhorted to pray for the Emperor *Constantinus*. This the Doctor takes for an evident Mark of a publick Liturgy in the *Diceess of Alexandria*. Now the matter stands thus: *Athanasius* is vindicating himself from the Aspersions cast upon him, That he had writ a Letter to the Tyrant *Maxentius*, and consequently was in League with him. Amongst other things, he saith he was so far from writing to that Tyrant and

Pag. 8a

Devil, (as he calls him) that when he and others were in the greatest *Consternation* and Fear, he not only prayed for *Constantius* himself, but he exhorted the People to pray for him; and upon his Exhortation they all testified their *Fidelity* to the Emperor, by a continued repetition of their desire that *Christ* would help him. Here is no intimation (that I can discern) of a *Liturgy* in that Church, by which he and the People were indispensably obliged to use these words in their constant Prayers. It could be but a very slight Proof of his *Loyalty*, only to use those words in his Prayers, which he might not by any means omit. But the passage rather seems to be a Declaration, that he did of his own accord persuade the people to pray for *Constantius*. And the Account he gives of what the people answered, plainly intimates, that their words were their own, and not words which were imposed on them. Nor do I perceive any thing in the Relation, which can oblige us to believe the words were spoken at the time of their Publick Worship. The words are these:

*Athanas. Apol.
ad Constant.
pag. 679.*

Μένοντες ἡμεῖς ἱεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῇ
καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῇ
καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτῇ

P. 83.

The Doctor produces another passage out of this Apology making for his purpose. "*Athanasius* " (saith the Doctor) also speaks of the Prayers at " the Communion as a distinct Office, affirming, that " the People offered up these Prayers with one voice, " and without any manner of disagreement; adding, " That in that great multitude there was but one " voice, when they unanimously answered, *Amen*. I do not find *Athanasius* saying any thing of the *Communion Office* here. He takes notice of the meeting, as being only for Prayer: ἀλλὰ Σάββατον ἐστὶν. The Case was

was this; *Athanasius* was accused, that he and the People assembled together in the great Church before it was finished, &c. He vindicates himself, and among other things, alledges the *conveniency of the place* for the People to offer up their Prayers in together. And whereas his Accusers might object, That they might have used the Churches for this purpose: He answers, The Churches were so small, they would not contain the People, and then propounds some Interrogations to convince that this was the fittest place they could pitch upon. *ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ μέγθους, &c.* Which was better, that the People should crowd by parcels into places which were not sufficient to contain them without danger, or that they should gather together into one place which was spacious enough to receive them, and where they might make one and the same voice, *ἡς συμπόσιας ὅς λαόν*, by the joynt agreement of the People? What he means by this one voice, by the joynt agreement of the People, he declares afterwards to be nothing else than their unanimous saying, *Amen*: For he immediately adds, This was the best (*viz.* their coming together into so large a place) because it manifested the agreement, *ἡμολογίας*, of the multitude, and God would the sooner regard them. For (continues *Athanasius*) if according to the Promise of our Saviour, if two agree concerning any thing which they do ask, it shall be done for them, what may be expected if one voice be made of so many people come together, saying to God, *Amen*? Or if the voice of so many people come together be made one, by saying to God, *Amen*? *τί ἰδὲ τοσούτων λαόν συναθροίσαν, μίαν γένουσαι φωνήν, λέγουσαν πρὸς θεόν, τὸ αἰνέειν;* Here is nothing that I see of a Form of Prayer, nor any Responses the people were to make; only here is an account of their declaring their Agreement and Consent, by their presence together, and by their

Pag. 83.

P. 83.

saying, *Amen*. This (I think) is but a very small Proof of a Liturgy. But (saith the Doctor) "In another Tract he tells us, The people mourned, and groaned to God in the Church, all of them crying to the Lord and saying, *Spare thy people, good Lord, &c.* which is an Original piece of Litany, &c. The Matter lies thus in *Athanasius*: *Athanasius* saith, that *Constantius* having made a Decree against the *Orthodox*, the people were very much concerned at it, and amongst other Expressions he hath these: *ἦν δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν ὁρθόδοξων, ἡ ἐκκλησία, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὁρθόδοξοις καὶ ἡ κλῆρος, καὶ οἱ λαοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c.* There was great mourning through the Church, and all the people groaned, crying unto the Lord, *Spare thy people, O Lord, &c.* But *Athanasius* doth not say the people used these words in the Church, as an ordinary and constant part of the *Publick Service*. He also adds a great many other Expressions which he saith they used, and which appear not to be any part of their constant Publick Worship; nor is there any intimation that any of these words were enjoined them: They are only a number of Expressions suited to the occasional Resentments they had upon a consideration of their present dangerous Circumstances. What the Doctor alledgeth, pag. 84. out of *Athanasius de Interp. Psalm.* had he represented the matter aright, would have appeared to have been nothing at all to the business of Liturgies. And whereas the Doctor doth say, That *Athanasius* orders the people to sing the *Psalms*, &c. it is nothing but his Advice to a single person, even *Marcellinus*, to whom the Epistle is writ. And he is so far from saying any thing of a Liturgy he would have Persons have recourse unto, that he adviseth to use none but Scripture words in their Prayers, and more especially to study the *Psalms*; there being no condition

*Athanas. ad
Solitar. p. 864.*

nion a person can be in, but he may find that in the *Psalms* which is very proper for him. And his best way, he saith, will be to get his own Affections and Soul in a frame and temper suitable to what is there exprest, and then keep to the very words there set down, *ὅτι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ᾠδαῖς ψαλμοῖς ἡμῶν ἐκείναις.* *Atbanas. de Interp. Psal. p. 963.*

These being the passages the Doctor hath brought from this *Great Father*, to attest what he asserts, I shall consider what he doth object against the Evidence Mr. *Clarkson* produced from the same Father, on his side. The Doctor saith, "His Adversary mentions" P. 84. "nothing of this Father but two places. And he complains with reference to the first, that the Historian is falsified, because τὰ ἱερὰ βιβλία (in the Plural Number) is translated the Bible. But I think the Doctor had no reason to say Mr. *Clarkson* did falsifie the Historian because of this; and that most learned Men, who know the *Bible* doth consist of more *Holy Books* than one, will acknowledge the Translation to be very proper, especially considering the ancient way of speaking concerning the *Books* we now call the *Bible*. And the Doctor must prove a little better than yet he hath, that there was a *Liturgie* at that time, and that *that Liturgie* was reckoned then amongst the *Sacred Books*, before he will perswade understanding People to believe that a *Liturgie* was comprehended in that Phrase. The passage this Phrase belongs to, which the Doctor thinks is not rightly translated, is in my Edition differently placed from what it seems to be in that Edition the Doctor used: Therefore if you have a mind to consult the Historian himself as *Valesius* hath published him, you must look *Socrat. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 27. pag. 64.* whereas the Doctor saith, "He hath shewed" P. 84. "that there were Books of Prayer in the Emperor" "Constan-

"*Constantine's Court*; I must needs say he hath shewed it so darkly, that I can no more discern Books of Prayer there, than I can a Liturgy in his next Quotation out of *Athanas. ad Orthodox. de Persecut. Arian.* because a Virgin who had a *Psalter* in her hand, was ill treated by the *Arians*. For though the Doctor doth say many of their Forms of Prayer were in that *Psalter*, yet *Athanasius* doth not say any such thing there.

Before I consider the other place the Doctor takes notice of, which is to be found in Mr. *Clarkson* touching this Father, it may be fit to mind you, that the Doctor was out in his reckoning, when he said that his Adversary did mention nothing of this Father, but two places: For immediately after the afore-mentioned Quotation out of *Socrates*, Mr. *Clarkson*, p. 14. quotes some passages out of *Athanasius* his own Works, which the Doctor thought fit to over-look, though it may be more to Mr. *Clarkson's* purpose, than either of those the Doctor hath made his Remarks upon. Indeed *Athanasius* is not rightly referred unto in Mr. *Clarkson's* Book; but though what he reports from *Athanasius*, is not to be found in his *Epist. ad African*, yet it may be found in his *Epist. ad Orthodox* Tom. i. p. 945, 946.

P. 85.

The second passage the Doctor takes notice of in Mr. *Clarkson*, relating to *Athanasius*, is out of *Theodoret*, who saith, That the Devils not being able to bear the power or efficacy of *Athanasius* his Preaching and Praying, ἐκείνους γὰρ οἱ δαίμονες τῆς ἁγίας γὰρ τῆς αἰνότητος τοῦ λόγου, &c. He stirred up his Servants against him. The Doctor translates it, *The Devil hated him for his fervent Praying, and rational Preaching*. Now in the present debate, the Question lies, whether τῶν λόγων, do note his using of his best abilities in the performance of both these Offices? And if so, whether he

Theod. Hist.
l. 3. c. 8.

P. 86.

he could be more bound up to Forms of Prayer, than
to Forms of Preaching : The Doctor saith, " It was
Athanasius his Devotion, not his Phrases, that was
" so terrible to the Devil, It is the inward Devotion
" of the Mind which he dreads, and that *Athanasius*
" did doubtless exercise to a very high degree, even
" in the Use of those Forms which were then allowed
" and prescribed in the Church. To which I answer :
There is no doubt but *Athanasius* did exercise inward
Devotion to a high degree, but there may be much
doubt whether he did exercise it in the *Use of Forms*.
And I conceive there is reason to think that *Atha-*
nasius was so violently opposed, not merely because
of his inward Devotion, but also because he did express
it in such a manner as was very likely to have a great
Effect, and to make very strong Impressions upon those
who heard him. *Theodoret*, in the same place where
he gives the fore-mentioned Account, acquaints us,
that those who address to *Julian*, that *Athanasius* might
be cast out of the City, gave this Reason why they
did desire his Removal : *ὁ Ἀθανάσιος, μισθός, ἐξουσία, δόξα,*
πᾶν, δοῦλος γὰρ οὐκ ἐστίν, πύριον χέει : If *Athanasius*
continue, there will not remain one Heathen ; for he will
draw all people to his side. Now they could not suspect
or fear his inward Devotion, nor have any knowledge
of it further than it was externally discovered. And if
he might not use any words whereby to express his
Devotion, but what others were as much Masters of
as himself, why should his Prayers be more feared
than others who could use the same words in the same
order, and with as much vehemence and earnestness
as it can be pretended he could ? And as for a Man's
inward Devotion, it cannot effect another, but in
proper.

proportion to the outward discovery which is made of it, and whereby it is represented unto him.

P. 86.

The Doctor next proceeds to the account *Theodoret* gives concerning *Flavianus* and *Diodorus*; of which I have spoken already, and therefore need not speak of it again: Besides it only concerns *singing alternately*, which is nothing to the present business. Here the Doctor pretends "*Theodoret* doth not say that way of singing began then, but only saith, the Custom of singing *David's Psalms* alternately did then first begin at *Antioch*. But I think *Theodoret* doth say somewhat more: For he saith that *Flavianus* and *Diodorus* did first divide the Choir into two parts. *ἑτοι μέτοι διχῶ δισαλίς τὸς ἄλλοις καὶ ἑαλίς*. The Doctor may

Theod. Hist.
lib. 2. cap. 24.

P. 89.

consider whether the Choir was like to sing alternately, before the Singers were divided into two parts: "Yea" (saith the Doctor) this way of singing by turns was "so taking at *Antioch*, that it drew all the People from "*Leontius*, so that he was forced to beg of *Flavianus* "to come back to the Church and perform the same "Liturgy there. And from hence, because here is the word *Liturgy*, he concludes, "That this Liturgy "consisted of Praise and Prayer, and the one being "in Set-Forms, the other must be so too. But *Theodoret* speaks only of their singing alternately, and it is only that Liturgy, for ought I can find in *Theodoret*, that *Leontius* desires they would perform in the Church. The word *Liturgy* is applied to every one of the Offices of Religion in particular, and by it self. There was the *Liturgy* of *Singing*, the *Liturgy* of *Prayer*, the *Liturgy* of *Preaching*, &c. but I do not mind any Instance I have met with hitherto, where the word *Liturgy* doth of it self import both *Hymns* and *Prayer*.

But

But supposing it did so here, what then? why then the Doctor saith, "It is very unlikely the Praises should be of one fashion, and the Prayers of another. But what his ground should be for this unlikeliness, I cannot imagin, unless he thinks they sang their Prayers alternately, as well as their Psalms and Hymns. And he might as well bring in their *Sermons* too, which the word *Liturgy* will reach as well as either of the other, and so conclude they had *Forms of Sermons*, and sang them also *alternately*; and then I hope there was *Musick* enough. The Doctor is willing to own, that *David's* Psalms begun now to be sung alternately, but that Hymns were sung so before. And is it not more unlikely that they should sing their *Hymns* after one fashion, and their *Psalms* after another, than that their *Psalms* and *Hymns* should be of one fashion, and their *Prayers* of another? I think there were three ways of singing in the Christian Church, and two of them came under the Name of *Antiphone*. But singing is not my business, and therefore I will say no more of it now. But the Doctor observes further, "That *Socrates* relates, that soon after this (in Opposition to the *Arians*) St. *Chrysostom* enlarged the Evening Prayers, which must be by adding to the Forms, because if it had been in every Minister's breast to make those Evening Prayers longer or shorter, as he pleased in his *extempore* way, there could have been no Addition made to them.

This is very *cunningly* found out of the Doctor; but what if they were wont to pray a quarter of an hour in the Evening, and St. *Chrysostom* brought in the practice of praying half an hour in the Evening, and yet without a limitation to Forms, would not the Prayers be encreased? I think if we duely consider

D

Socrates,

Socrat. Hist.
lib. 6. cap. 7.

Socrates, (though he useth the word *εὐχὰς*) we shall have reason to conclude, that he speaks of, and means only encreasing the *Evening Hymns*. Socrates his words are these, *εὐχὰς δὲ πλείους ἢ τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς συνήθους ὕμνου, εὐχὰς ἐξ αἰτίας τοιαύτης*. And if you consider the next Chapter, where he relates the Occasion and Ground of St. Chrysostom's making this enlargement of the *Evening Office*, you will find he gives an account only of St. Chrysostom's appointing some of his Party to sing *Night Hymns*, in Opposition to the *Arians* in the course they took at that time.

P. 94, 95:

St. Cyril' is the Doctor's next Author. In whose *Mystagogical Catechisms* he pretends "there is such
" full Proof of a prescribed Form being then used at
" the Eucharist, in the Church of *Jerusalem*, at that
" time, that he must have a Forehead of Brass who can
" deny it. I have perused all that the Doctor doth al-
ledge out of St. Cyril, and all that St. Cyril himself doth
say in *those Catechisms*; and yet I cannot see any *Form*
of Prayer there, except the *Lord's Prayer*, nor any inti-
mation that the Priests were obliged to use *prescribed*
Forms of Prayer at the *Eucharist*. He reckons up
indeed several things they did ordinarily pray for
then, but he does not say they did constantly pray for
these things in the *same words*, much less that they
were *obliged* to do so. It appears from St. Cyril, that
it was usual, upon particular Occasions at the Eucha-
rist, for the Priest to make a short Exhortation
before he began to Pray, and before he began the
solemn Thanksgiving, and for the people to declare
their readiness to comply with those Exhortations; and
that this was a Custom which did not begin at that
time, he thought it a *laudable Custom* derived to them
by

by *Tradition*. But there is no intimation in *St. Cyril*, that the Prayer, or Thanksgiving which were to follow these Exhortations, and the Peoples Answers, were always to be offered up in the same words, or that they were Forms composed to their hands, and imposed on them. The Doctor thinks *St. Cyril* had respect to *St. James's* Liturgy, in which there are these very Exhortations and Answers, and Forms of Prayer and Praise are there set down after these Exhortations and Answers. I think, if we compare *St. Cyril's* account of Matters with that Liturgy, we shall see some Reason to conclude, that neither Ministers nor People were strictly bound up to the Use of prescribed words in their Exhortations and Answers; for those *St. Cyril* saith they used, and which he explains, are not exactly the same with those in the Liturgy. The Doctor insists much on these Exhortations and Answers, calling them *Forms*, and alledging them as Proofs of a Liturgy. But they are prescribed Forms of Prayer which the Doctor should produce, or Proofs that there were such. But these Forms the Doctor finds in *St. Cyril*, were not Forms of Prayer, nor any parts of their Prayers. The Doctor is willing to oblige his Reader with an Observation here; which is this, "That *St. Cyril* was here expounding the Liturgy
 "(not to Priests, who are presumed to understand
 "their part of the Office, but) to the Faithful, who
 "knew the words of these publick Forms, which re-
 "quired their distinct Answer, but perhaps might
 "not fully understand the sence, and therefore *St. Cyril*
 "here briefly passes over the Priest's part, and only
 "enlarges upon the People's share of the Office.
 But *St. Cyril* doth explain some of the Exhortations, which belonged to the Priests, as largely as he doth

P. 93i

some of the Answers which pertained to the People. And if St. Cyril was Expounding the Liturgy (as the Doctor saith he was) how came it to pass that he explained not one Prayer excepting the *Lord's Prayer*, if the Prayers were prescribed Forms? If the Reason was (as the Doctor insinuates) that the Prayers were the Priests part, and they were presumed to understand their own part, I think his Reason is very weak, at least was not strong enough to determine him to observe St. Cyril's method, when he engaged in the Exposition of *our Liturgy*. Did the Priests in St. Cyril's days better understand their part, than ours do theirs? Or were the People less concerned then to understand the Prayers of the Church, than they be now? The Doctor's Observation, instead of helping his Cause, will indanger the tempting of people to think that the Prayers and Thanksgivings then, were not prescribed Forms; and that a Liturgy in St. Cyril's days, was no more than a bare *Rubrick* or *Order for the Publick Worship*, without any subjoyned *Forms*. St. Cyril does explain the general Orders, he explains the words which were generally used at the time of their Publick Worship, but he expounds not any *one Prayer* besides the *Lord's Prayer*, nor does he say their Prayers did consist of *prescribed words*. He does take notice of the *Lord's Prayer*, and this we know does consist of *prescribed words*; and this Prayer he expounds unto them, but no other Prayer doth he expound, and for ought any one can tell, for this very Reason, because the other Prayers were not *prescribed Forms*, and so he knew not in what words they would be expressed. But the Doctor saith, " That St. Cyril briefly describes the Prayer of
 " Consecration, and the Prayer for all estates of Men,
 " which

“ which were said by the Priest alone. But he neither tells us what words those Prayers did consist of, nor that they were prescribed Forms. “ After this (saith “ the Doctor) you say the Lord’s Prayer, which being “ the Peoples part, is there largely expounded. But St. Cyril speaks of this and of the other Prayers in the very same manner, and in the same Person, without using any expression whereby it may be concluded that he did appropriate this Prayer to the People. And though the Doctor affirms, That *after this* (St. Cyril saith) *you say the Lord’s Prayer*; it is quite otherwise: for St. Cyril’s words are, *ἔπειτα λέγουσιν τὸν κύριον*, &c. *then, or after this, we say the Lord’s Prayer*. Further the Doctor saith, “ That though St. Cyril doth not presume to “ set down and explain the Priest’s part (*Unimitated* “ *Modesty!*) yet that is made up by the ancient Liturgy, which goes under St. James his Name, the “ ancient part of which I will now prove was the “ Publick Service of the Church at Jerusalem, long before St. Cyril’s time.

P. 95.

Thus the Doctor hath an Ope to discourse of St. James his Liturgy. And you see what the Doctor hath undertaken to prove; viz. *That the ancient part of that Liturgy which goes under St. James his Name, was the Publick Service of the Church at Jerusalem, long before St. Cyril’s time*. When I read these words, I expected the Doctor would have certified us which was that part of this Liturgy he calls *Ancient*; and that he would then have produced some considerable Proof that that part was the publick Service of the Church before St. Cyril’s time. But when I had read his Discourse concerning this Liturgy, I found not any thing at all which might properly be said to be pertinent to what he had undertaken to prove; and what he declares a-fresh, p. 96. he doth

P. 96, 97. *doth maintain.* The only thing which looks like a Proof, is his arguing from the *Harmony and agreement there is between St. James his Liturgy, and that account I have spoken of, which St. Cyril gives of the usage of the Church in his time.* And this doth only look like a Proof, for it is not a real Proof of what it is alledged for; nor doth it any more prove that this Liturgy was before St. Cyril's time, than it doth, that any other Liturgy which hath the same agreement with St. Cyril's Discourse, was made before that Discourse. As for the Doctor's quoting *Proclus, the 32d. Canon of the Council in Trullo, and Balsamon,* to prove what he maintains, I need not say any thing to it, because were these Testimonies ever so *Authentick and Express,* they would not satisfie considering Persons that this Liturgy was the publick Service of the Church at *Jerusalem* long before St. Cyril's time, they being every one of a much younger date than St. Cyril himself. But I think *Proclus* his Epistle wants some Evidence to prove it to be *genuine.* The Council in *Trullo,* by the Doctor's own reckoning, is above three hundred years younger than St. Cyril; and *Balsamon* is more hundreds of years younger than that. But because the Doctor treats Mr. *Clarkson* somewhat rudely here, it may be fit to vindicate the deceased Person's Reputation a little, especially considering he is abused, and was a person so eminently Learned, that a particular deference is owing to him, from those of all *Persuasions* who do acknowledge that *Learning* deserves *Respect.* I speak this only from the sense I have of the Veneration which is due to him on the account of the very modest discoveries he gave the World of his Learning and Judgment; for I never saw his Person, neither do I know any thing more concerning him, than what

I have learned from his published Labours. If it were in my power, I would vindicate every Learned Man who is *deceased*, from injurious Accusations; and I am willing to think that many of the Doctor's Expressions concerning Mr. *Clarkson*, are rather the product of his *Haste*, than genuine discoveries of his Spirit.

I think the Doctor is here under some Mistakes, though he expresses himself with great assurance. His words are these: "It is most notoriously false in our Adversary, to say *Balsamon* declares in his Notes upon this Canon (*viz.* 32.) of *Trullo*, that the Greeks under the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and those of the Diocess of the *Orient*, utterly disclaimed this Liturgy twelve hundred years after Christ. Here is the first of the Doctor's mistakes touching this matter: For Mr. *Clarkson* (in the place the Doctor refers us to, *viz.* p. 149.) does not say *Balsamon* declares this in his Notes upon this Canon of *Trullo*, but quotes another Treatise of *Balsamon* for it, *viz.* *Resp. ad Marc.* and his Quotation is very full and expresses for what he alleges it, as you may see in the Margin of his 149th Page. The Doctor goes on thus: "For *Balsamon* there affirms, that St. James, the Brother of our Lord, being the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, first delivered an Holy Liturgy, but the Church of *Constantinople* (having another Form in his time) did not receive it; nor would he permit the Patriarch of *Alexandria* to use it in his great Church as he desired, though *Balsamon* confess it was used by those of *Jerusalem* and *Palestine* on great Festivals even in his time. Here I think the Doctor mistakes again in several particulars: For if I understand *Balsamon* aright, he doth say there is no Evidence but this Canon.

P. 98.

Balsam. Sup-
plem. in Can. 32.
Concil. in Trul.
p. 1115.

Canon (ἐπιτάγματα τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου τῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c.) that St. James did make a Liturgy. And as for the Liturgy which went under his Name, he saith we have not found it, nor do not know it: (οὐκ εἶμεν οὐδὲ γινώσκουμεν) and that he doth not know how the Priests in *Palestine* do officiate, who observe the Liturgy delivered, as they pretend (ἡμῶν) by St. James, nor how the Bishops and Priests at *Alexandria* do Officiate, who use Prayers, as they say (ἡμῶν) delivered by St. Mark, but do not use or follow St. Basil or St. Chrysostom's Liturgy (for it seems the Liturgies which go under these Names, were used at *Constantinople*, and most other places in *Balsamon's* days, that is, in the Twelfth Century.) But this he saith he can confidently affirm, That the Patriarch of *Alexandria* dwelling in *Constantinople*, and desiring to Officiate amongst them, used the way he was accustomed unto at *Alexandria*; which differing from what was usual then at *Constantinople*, gave some offence; upon which he told them, he would not do so any more, and this satisfied them all. This I take to be the true sence of what *Balsamon* doth say of this matter in his Notes on this Canon; and how far the Doctor mistook, you may judge by comparing the two Accounts together.

After all, I may suppose that many of these Prayers in this Liturgy were framed and extant in this Century, and yet be under no Obligation to own that they were the publick Service of the Church; and that they were so enjoined, that the Priests might not use any words in their Administrations, but what were in those Prayers. And this is what the Doctor should prove, after it is supposed there were such Prayers extant then. But the Doctor doth neither

ther tell us which of these Prayers (except the *Lord's Prayer*) were before *St. Cyril's* time; nor doth he prove that any of them were used in the publick Worship before that time.

From *St. James's* Liturgy the *Doctor* proceeds to *Clement's* Constitutions. Where he saith, " There
" is another Liturgy, and a clear and undeniable Evi-
" dence, that there was a prescribed Liturgy and Forms
" of Prayers used upon all publick Occasions. And
pag. 114. he ends his Discourse concerning this Li-
turgy with these words: " These Forms in the Con-
" stitutions were the Liturgy of some Eastern
" Church.

P. 103.

The method the *Doctor* takes in discoursing about these Constitutions is this. First, He gives many instances of Forms that are in these Constitutions. Secondly, He pretends to Answer *Mr. Clarkson's* *Crafty Cavils and Objections* (as he calls them) relating to this clear Witness. But the main thing the *Doctor* should have done, was this, To prove from these Constitutions, that Forms of Prayer were so imposed on the Officers of the Church in their publick Administrations, that they must use them, and none but them; or at least, that *these Forms in the Constitutions were the Liturgy of some Eastern Church, from which the Administrators might in no case vary.* But the *Doctor* was pleased to lay this Consideration aside; and therefore he having offered no Proof of either of these things in all the Pages which are spent about these Constitutions, there is no need of saying much to what the *Doctor* hath here offered to his *Reader*. I shall therefore only mind you, First, That the Learned are not agreed about the time when these Constitutions were

P. 106.

E

framed.

framed. And therefore tho Mr. *Clarkson* hath thrust down this Writer one whole Century from that wherein the Doctor doth place him, yet he alledges *the Great and most Learned Archbishop Usher* for his doing so, who perhaps was a Person as well qualified to make a just Judgment about this kind of Matters, as any of those who have made this Writer older. And though the Doctor doth undertake to prove Mr. *Clarkson's* Opinion of the time when this Writer lived notoriously false, because the Fathers of the Fourth Century do cite this Book as a known Book, yet I think the Doctor is a little *unhappy* in his Quotations. The matter is not of much weight in the present business, and therefore I will not trouble you with what might be said to his several Quotations for the invalidating of them; I will only take notice of one or two of them, which are apparently defective. The Doctor saith, "*Athanasius* reckons this Book (which he calls "the Doctrine of the Apostles) amongst those which "the Fathers allowed to be read in the Church. Now I cannot find any such thing in the Epistle the Doctor refers unto in his Margin; the Books or Writings *Athanasius* there speaks of, are the Holy Scriptures. *παρα τῶν ἀποστόλων γεγραμμένων.* I do not see any thing there like the Apostolical Constitutions. There is indeed this Phrase there, *ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν παρακαλῶν.* Whether the Doctor means this, I know not, for he doth not quote *Athanasius* his words; but if he mean this, I think he doth mistake, and that it will appear to any one who considers the place in *Athanasius*, that *Athanasius* means the Epistles of the Apostles. But I am apt to think the Doctor, had he a little better considered his Margin, would not have referred to that Epistle, but to another Tract of *Athanasius*, viz. his *Synopsis*;

P. 106.

*Athanas. Epist.
ad Ammon.
tom. 2. p. 37.*

Synopsis; where *Athanasius* doth mention the *Doctrine of the Apostles*, and speaks of either real or supposititious works of *Clement*. Yet I think this would not serve the Doctors turn, for I do not see any reason to conceive that *Athanasius* did attribute the Book he calls *Διδαχὴ Ἀποστόλων*, to *Clement*, or that it was the book which now carries the Title of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. I think he mentions it as a book distinct from those he takes notice of, which are ascribed to *Clement*. Nor do I see any reason to convince a man that his *Κλημέντια*, did comprehend in them these Constitutions. The next Author the Doctor quotes for this purpose is *Eusebius*, who (he saith) "computes it among those Writings which were approved by the Ancients. But the Doctors margin here is very lame. I do not at present mind that *Eusebius* hath such a passage. But this I think is plain, that *Eusebius* when he speaks of *Clements* Epistle, and other writings which were attributed to him, makes no mention there of the Constitutions of the Apostles. *Euseb. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 38. p. 110*. I may take notice of the Doctors quotations out of *Epiphanius*, when I come to his discourse on that Author, for there we have these quotations again.

Athanas. Synop. Sac. Script. Tom. 2. p. 154.

P. 107.

But supposing this book was extant in this Age, I do not see how that will prove, what it is alledged for. I will grant there are Forms of Prayer in this Book fitted or adapted to the several parts of Publick Worship. But what is this to a Liturgy in the present sence? The question is not, whether there were a Book extant in the Fourth Century, in which were Forms of Prayer suited to all the parts of Publick Worship? There might be twenty or more such Books extant for any thing that I know to the contrary. But the

Doctor should prove, that either these Prayers in the Constitutions, or some other Forms of Prayer, were imposed on the Administrators, so that they might not use any Prayers but those. It is in my judgment but a very poor way of proving Liturgies under the present consideration, by producing a Book wherein there are Prayers, framed by *no body know's whom*, nor *no body knows where*, nor *no body knows exactly when*. That there were Books wherein were Prayers framed according to the order and method usually observed in the publick Worship, with directions how and when to use every one of them, is no proof, that those Prayers were constantly used, and that no other Prayers might be used in publick. The Doctor should have proved that these Prayers were enjoyed, or at least, that they were constantly used in some one Church without diminution or addition. But I think the Doctor hath not one Passage here to this effect. I shall further mind you, that what is in these Constitutions which bears a proportion to what is ordinarily called the *Rubrick* in other Books, is not worth considering. For if the *Rubrick* had been never so positive in saying this, or that Prayer shall be used at such or such a time, or by such or such a person, and the phrase had never been mollified, as the Doctor doth acknowledge it is several times in this Book, yet that *Rubrick* could not have force enough of it self, to lay any obligation upon any one, to use those Prayers as it directs. Forms of Prayer introduced with *Rubricks*, have no Intrinsic force of their own, but derive and borrow all their Authority, from something else.

Hillary of Poitiers is the Doctors next Author, out of whom he alledges some passages to prove what he hath undertaken. But I shall pass over his quotation without

without any Reflection at all, because I have not the Author by me : And will proceed to what he hath alledged under the next head, which is of *Julian* the Apostate.

The Doctor here endeavours to prove a Liturgy in the Christian-Church, from the account given by *Nazianzen* and *Sozomen*, of *Julians* endeavour to establish and promote *Paganism*, by accommodating it as much as possible to Christianity. And it is true, that these Authors in their reporting some instances wherein *Julian* endeavoured to make *Paganism* look more like Christianity, have these expressions *ἵνα τὸ πᾶν ὡς χριστιανικὸν κατασκευάσῃ* *ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὁρῇ ὡς τὸν ἐν μέσῳ*. I will not be positive what they do mean by these expressions. But seeing this is mentioned as one instance wherein *Julian* reformed the *Pagan* practice, and brought in a usage amongst them, by which they would more resemble the Christian assemblies, than they did before, I am inclined to think, these Authors do not mean *prescribed Forms of Prayer*, for it is certain the *Pagans* had their days and hours for Prayers before, and it is more probable their Prayers were Forms, than that the Christians were. And to bring in Praying by Forms, would not be an alteration, nor any more an imitation of the Christians (supposing they had Forms) than it was before. Therefore I suppose something else is here meant by these Authors. And from *Nazianzen's* way of expressing it, I conjecture the meaning is not Prayers, but Hymns. And that they design to acquaint us, that *Julian* brought into the *Pagan* Assemblies that way of singing alternately, which did so prevail amongst the Christians. What the Doctor doth produce from *Julian* himself, I think makes not any thing for the proof of Liturgies in the Christian Church, The Doctor found
the

P. 115.

*Sozom. hist. l. 5.
c. 16. Naz. in
Jul. orat. 1.*

P. 116.

the word Liturgy there, and therefore produceth it, as a proof of what he doth assert but *λειτουργία*, doth not in this place of *Julian*, signify *prescribed forms of Prayer*, but the *exercise of the Priest's office*, for *Julian* perswades the Priest to pray at least morning and evening and tells them it is very convenient and fit they should pray at both these times every day, even at those seasons, or during that time, when it is not their turn to Officiate publickly. And that it becomes them to observe those things which the Law of the Country did injoyn in their Temples, doing neither more nor less than that. *Julian's* words are

Jul. Imp. Frag.
in Oper. p. 352

these: *εὐλογον ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τοῖς θεοῖς, ἀπαρχισαὶ καὶ διασημάτων, ὅταν ἔξωθεν τῆς ἱερᾶς οἰκῆς τυχάνωμεν λειτουργίας· οἱ τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὅσα πάτερ διαγορεύει νόμος, φυλάττειν πρέπει· καὶ ὅτε πλέον, ὅτε ἑλαττόν τι ποιήσιν αὐτοῖς.* Whether the Law of that Country did injoyn the use of prescribed forms of Prayer in the *Pagan Temples*, is of no moment in the present case, but *Julian* doth not affirm any such thing here, and it is evident *λειτουργία* is not here used in the sense the Doctor would have it.

P. 117.

“The next place (saith the Doctor) must be assigned to the *Council of Laodicea*. Where the Doctor takes notice only of two *Canons* which concern Prayers, therefore I need not consider what he saith about the *Seventh* and *Fifteenth Canons*, which affect not the matter in hand. But because the Doctor doth utter in the *Fifty ninth Canon*, as if it were of some use to him, it may be fit to say something of the meaning and occasion of that Canon. “It is certain (saith the Doctor) they had no great esteem “for *extempore* Composures, nor for variety of Forms “neither, because they forbid the reading of *Psalms* “composed by private Men in the Church. Now that
that

Ibidem.

that Canon doth forbid to read private Psalms in the Church, and Books which are not Canonical; and requires that no Books but the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament be read in the Church.

ὅτι ὁ δὲ ἰδιωτικὸς ψαλμὸς λέγεται ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ ἀκανόνικα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καυῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.

Can. 52.

Balsamon saith, there were found Psalms besides David's 150. which were attributed to Solomon, and some others. The Fathers therefore calling these *Private*, decreed, That neither those Psalms, nor any thing else should be read in the Church, but what is reckoned up in the Eighty fifth Canon of the Apostles. Thus far Balsamon in his Notes on this Canon. Now this is certain, that this Canon doth say, no Books must be read in the Church, but the Canonical Books of the *Old and New Testament*. And though Liturgies might in time become *Canonical-Books*, yet certainly they are not, nor ever were *Canonical-Books of the Old or New Testament*. So that this Canon seems to be as clear against the reading of *Liturgies* in the Church, though attributed to ever such excellent and famous Men, as against Psalms which were fathered upon Solomon, &c.

Pag. 890.

The two Canons of this Council the Doctor insists on, and which relate to Prayers, are the Eighteenth and the Nineteenth. The Eighteenth Canon is set down in these words, οὐ τὴν τιμὴν αὐτῶν λειτουργίας οὐδ' εὐχὰς πάντοτε, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐνοαταῖς, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑσπέραις ὁρῶμεν γίνεσθαι. The Doctor having Englished this Canon, relates the sense which Balsamon and Zonaras do put on it. Which is indeed very express for the Doctor's purpose. But here you may take notice, that both these Authors living about the Twelfth Century, their Authority in explaining Ancient Canons made so many hundreds of years before them, is not very considerable, further

ther than they do back and confirm what they lay down as their Opinion with good Reason and Evidence. And what *Balsamon* saith, is his meer Conjecture, laid down without alledging any Evidence at all for what he pretends to be the occasion of making that Canon. *Zonaras* grounds his Opinion upon what he pretends to be the sense of one of the *Carthaginian* Canons, and he acknowledgeth it is but probable that his Conjecture is right. *ἡ δὲ ἐκείνη*, &c. The Fathers in this Council having not left behind them any Relation (that I know of) of the Occasion of their making this Canon, I think we cannot prove any thing from it, further than the words of the Canon will warrant. I shall therefore wave taking notice of many things the *Doctor* doth deliver under this Head, and only consider what doth directly concern the Canon it self. " Mr. *Clarkson* saith here is no-
 " thing to signifie that it was the intent of the Synod
 " to have the same Prayers used at the times specified.
 " And to make this out, he saith, neither the whole
 " Phrase, nor any word in it, imports such a thing.
 " He begins with the word *ἡ δὲ ἐκείνη*, and saith that
 " will not serve the turn, for it doth not here (as in
 " latter times) signifie a Book or Model of prescribed
 " and stinted Forms of Prayer. That no instance hath
 " been produced, or can be, wherein it is used in this
 " sense by any of the Ancients before this Council, or
 " long after. But *ἡ δὲ ἐκείνη* according to the ancient
 " use of the word, denotes sometimes a publick Fun-
 " ction or Office, most commonly the Exercise and
 " Administration of it, and then it is not the Forms
 " of Action, but the Action it self, the publick Use,
 " Employment, Exercise or Ministration of that to
 " which it is applied Civil or Religious. Applied to
 " Wor.

"Worship, it is not the Forms of Worship, but the mini-
 "stration of it. So applied to Prayer, *λειτουργία* ἢ *δοχῶν* here,
 "is not a Model of prescribed Prayers, but the exercise of
 "Praying. To this the *Doctor* answers, "We can
 "prove *λειτουργία* was used for a prescribed Form of Ser-
 "vice, not only after this Council, but before it. Now
 to prove it after will not signifie much, for no doubt
 the Council used that word in a sense that was then
 known, and not in a sense which was not then, but
 might be in after ages applied to it. The *Doctor's* bu-
 siness should have been to have proved that *λειτουργία*
 was used before this Council for prescribed Forms of
 Prayer in the Christian Church; and if he had pro-
 ved this effectually, he had done much to have carri-
 ed his point. But the *Doctor* having declared what he
 can prove, multiplies Quotations for several Pages,
 the greatest number of which Quotations by far, are
 of a later date than this Council; and those which
 are as old do not relate to Prayers, as he himself ac-
 knowledgeth. He doth not produce one passage where
λειτουργία is applied to Prayers in the Christian Church,
 which is as ancient as the Canon he is discoursing of.
 And there is scarce one passage in the whole number
 of his Quotations, which can admit the sense he fa-
 stens on *λειτουργία*, but this word must be taken in the
 sense Mr. *Clarkson* hath assigned, if we will make the
 Author intelligible. I will set down one instance, and
 leave you to consider the rest as they lie in the *Doctor's*
 Book. "Synesius saith, *Andronicus* made him so unfit
 "to pray, that he was forced to omit the Liturgy of
 "the Altar. Now what other sense can these words
 admit of, than this, That he was forced to omit the
 ministration of that Service which was to be perfor-
 med at the Altar? According to the best judgment I

Pag. 158.

Pag. 122.

Pag. 125.

can make at present, it will be very hard to prove the use of prescribed Forms of Prayer from the word *λειτουργία*, till a great while after prescribed Forms were used. For *λειτουργία* as applied to Prayers, did signifie the Exercise of Prayer, or Ministration of Prayers, and did not determine the manner of the Ministration. After that prescribed Forms were used, *λειτουργία* signified the Ministration of Prayers, both by and without Forms; and it was a great while before that word came to be ordinarily appropriated to the Prayers themselves. The *Doctor* at last owns it is but probable that the word may signifie what he pretends, in this Council; though I think he hath not offered any thing by way of proof, which makes it so much as probable. And whereas the *Doctor* saith there are many evidences in this Council that there was such a prescribed Form, referring in his Margin to *Can. 15. and 59th*, this is only affirmed by the *Doctor*, for neither of those Canons doth say a word of Prayers. The *Doctor* doth also misrepresent *Balsamon* concerning the *ἀγέλας*, for *Balsamon* doth not say they were by it, to give notice to the people to answer.

The next thing Mr. *Clarkson* was to prove was this, That as the word *λειτουργία* will not prove a prescribed Liturgy, so the whole phrase will not do it neither: “For the phrase let it be observed, that the expression is not, *τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν ἁγίων ὡς ἔστιν*: this indeed might “have signified the use of the same Prayers; but “*τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν ὡς ἔστιν*, is no more here the praying “of the same Prayers at three, and six afternoon, than “*τὴν αὐτὴν ἀποστολὴν ὡς ἔστιν*, would have been the “preaching of the same Sermon twice in the afternoon. And as there might have been *ἡ αὐτὴ λειτουργία* “*ἡ ἑμὴ*, the same Exercise of Singing at Nones and

" and Vespers , without singing the same Psalms at
 " both hours, and the same Service or Exercise of rea-
 " ding the Scriptures , tho the same Chapters had not
 " been read, or any by the prescript of a Rubrick, and
 " the same Ministry or Exercise of Preaching, tho the
 " same Sermons had not been preached twice over
 " within three hours, or without using any set forms
 " of Homilies; as well might there be *ἡ αὐτὴ λειτουργία*.
 " *αὐτὴν ὥραν*, the same Exercise of praying at the third
 " and sixth hours, without using the same Prayers, or
 " any set Forms at all. Now what the *Doctor* saith
 concerning the whole phrase is this, (for he takes no
 notice of what Mr. *Clarkson* had said concerning it)
 " The same Liturgy of Prayers must be expounded of
 " repeating the same Forms over again. And if we
 " translate it, the same Ministration of Prayers (as he
 " desires) still it cannot be meant of new and varied
 " *extempore* Prayers; the Priest who prays so differ-
 " ently cannot properly be said to use the same Mini-
 " stration. You may easily judg which account of the
 whole phrase appears most natural, now they are set
 so near one to the other. It seems somewhat strange
 to me, that the *Doctor* should discourse at this rate, as
 if a Priest could not perform the same Office of Prayer
 unless he should always use the very same words. But
 saith the *Doctor*, " Then these words, *ἡ αὐτὴν ὥραν*,
 " signifie nothing. Yes, they signifie that there should
 be publick Prayers both at three and at six of the
 Clock; and this there might be, and no need to re-
 peat the same Prayers over again.

P. 126.

P. 127.

Mr. *Clarkson* further saith, " No Rational account
 " can be given why the same Prayers must be used at
 " six which were used at three Afternoon, no Decree
 " parallel to this (if so taken) can be produced, nor any

P. 160.

P. 127.

"thing in the practice of the Church before or after
 "agreeable to it. After unalterable Forms were in-
 "troduced, their several hours had their different
 "Offices accommodated to the season. To this the
 Doctor saith, "The Prayers at three, were then, as
 "they are now, Prayers proper for the Evening. But
 we have only the Doctor's word for it, either that
 there were then prescribed Forms of Prayer, or if
 there were, that those Forms of Prayer which were
 for three, were proper to be used at six. And there
 is some reason to suspect the Doctor did declare his
 judgment about this matter at all adventures, especially
 considering the Ancients who do speak of the several
 hours of Prayer, do assign peculiar reasons for Prayer
 at every one of those hours. And it is to be supposed
 their Prayers were in some measure proportioned to
 their reasons. And seeing their reasons for praying at
 three were not the same for their praying at six, the
 same Prayers would not suit with both seasons. Nor
 do only St. Chrysostom and Basil, whom the Doctor
 makes younger than this Council, assign distinct rea-
 sons for Prayers at these several hours, but the Author
 of the Apostolical Constitutions does so too, whom
 the Doctor makes older than this Council.

Διαταγαὶ τῆς
 ἁγίας ἀποστό-
 λων· Βιβλ. β.
 λς'.

P. 129.

The other Canon of this Council the Doctor takes
 notice of as making for him, is the 19th. where it is
 ordered that after the Catechumens and Penitents are
 dismissed, three Prayers of the Faithful should be per-
 formed in this manner: (ἔτας τῇ πρῶτῃ τὰς δούχαις γίνεσθαι
 τρεῖς) the first διὰ σιωπῆς, the second and third, διὰ
 περιρρημάτων. What is meant by διὰ σιωπῆς, the Learned
 are not agreed. Balsamon seems to be of opinion that
 the use of the Church at this time, was not the same
 with that in his days, and therefore cares not to med-
 dle

P. 836.

die with this part of the Canon. But the *Doctor* thinks
 "the first of these prayers was the Collect which the
 "Bishop alone makes for the Faithful, without any
 "Response to be made by the people after it, the Form
 "of which we have in the Constitutions; and *ἡ εὐ-
 "χὴ*, he thinks, doth signifie that there was no Excla-
 "mation at the end of it. But here I must mind you
 that there are other Prayers in those Constitutions be-
 sides that the *Doctor* refers unto, where the people are
 not required to make any Response or Exclamation;
 and therefore this can be no reason why that should
 be the Prayer here meant, rather than any of the
 other. And whereas the *Doctor* doth say, "the other
 "two, are the two Litanies set down in the Prayers
 "of the Faithful (referring to *Constit. Apostol. lib. 8.*
 "c. 13, 18, 19.) which Litanies were always said *ἡ
 "ἁποστολικὴ*, with loud voice, and an exclamation
 "especially at the end of every Petition, to give no-
 "tice to the people to be ready with their Responses,
 "*Domine miserere*, or the like. The Constitutions do
 not say any such thing. There is a long sort of *bidding*
of Prayer in these Constitutions, which is all of it to
 be said by the Deacon, and there is not any order for
 any Response to be made either during that part of
 the Service, or at the end of it. The other
 Prayer which the *Doctor* calls a Litany, is ordered
 to be said by the Bishop, but there is no order
 for any Response till the end, and there the
 people are only ordered to say, *Amen*. How *Do-
 mine miserere* came into the *Doctor's* mind when spea-
 king of a *Greek Liturgy* I cannot tell: Indeed the peo-
 ple are once in these Constitutions ordered to say,
κύριε ἰσχυρόν, at the end of every Petition pronounced
 by

P. 131.

by the Deacon in one of his biddings of prayer; but that can be nothing to this Canon, because it was to go before the dismissal of the Catechumens. The *Doctor* further informs us that "the Author of the Constitutions is the best Comment upon this Canon, and both makes it very intelligible, and proves the Offices were all done by a stated Liturgy and in set Forms. But the *Doctor* hath no where proved (that I know of) that these Constitutions were ever used as the Liturgy of any Church. The Council doth not refer any where unto them. Nor is it certain they were extant before this Council. The Council says nothing of prescribed Forms here, but only directs that three prayers be made, and in what order they are to be made. And tho the *Doctor* is of opinion that the Catechumens were dismissed for fear they should learn phrases, I do not see any evidence that that was the only, or indeed any reason of their dismissal.

Ibid.

P. 132.

The *Doctor's* next Author is *Optatus Milevitanus*, "He hath (saith the Dr.) divers expressions, which suppose and imply, that there was in his time a Liturgy used in *Africa*; for he mentions the peoples joyning with the Priest in the Divine Service, and blames the *Donatists* for shutting the mouths of all Nations, and forcing all the people to be silent; which shews they used alternate Singing and Responses among the Orthodox. Now *Optatus* was shewing that the Christian Church was diffused over all the world, and that the *Donatists* by confining the Church to themselves did Unchurch all the Christian Assemblies in all other parts of the world; and that whereas God had commanded his name should be praised in all the earth, from the rising of the Sun to the going down of the same,

same, this could not be done, but all the world must be silent, besides themselves, if they only were the Church. If you say the Church is only with you, *Frangitis autem corpus Domini, si vos soli laudatis, totus tacebit orbis, qui est ab ortu solis usque ad occasum; clausistis ora omnium Christianorum gentium, indixistis silentium populis universis, Deum per momenta laudare cupientibus.* Is there any ground to discourse as the Doctor doth from these words? "Yea, he declares (saith the Doctor)

Optat. Milev.
lib. 2. p. 38.

"there were some certain words so established and enjoined by Law in the celebration of the Sacrament, that the *Donatists* themselves could not pass them by.

P. 133.

You shall see now what *Optatus* doth say in this place, which the Doctor did apprehend so clear for his purpose: *Optatus* continuing his Discourse concerning the Catholick Church as dispersed through all the world, does expostulate with the *Donatists* about their Unchurching all those great numbers of Christians, which were in all other parts of the world, and restraining the Church to their own small number, *Contra quos*

Optat. Milev.
lib. 2. p. 32.

(viz. *populos Christianos Provinciarum omnium, & innumerabilium insularum*) *vos soli pauci, rebelles estis, & cum quibus nullum communione consortium possidetis.* He goes on and tells them, He may here condemn their false notion, or their lye, (*mendacium vestrum*) from their own practice, in that they do daily celebrate the Sacrament, and from what they themselves do say, they do in that celebration; He first endeavours to convince them from their own practice; Seeing you do daily celebrate the Sacrament, saith he, *Quis dubitet, vos illud legitimum in Sacramentorum mysterio præterire non posse?* The debate now is what *illud legitimum* imports? Mr. *Clarkson* thought it was the Prayer of Consecration. The Doctor thinks "it is the Prayer

P. 61.

P. 133.

P. 134.

“Prayer for the Catholick Church, and that the words
 “of this Prayer were so enjoyned by Law, the *Donatists*
 “*themselves* could not pass them by, And that
 “*Legitimum* cannot signifie any thing but a Form en-
 “joyned by the Laws of the Church. I think the Do-
 “ctor is mistaken here, and that *Optatus* opposeth some-
 “thing in *Sacramentorum mysterio*, (which I suppose
 “must be interpreted) in the *Consecration*, to their con-
 “fining the whole Church to themselves, who were so
 “few (as is reported above): The sense of this contro-
 “verted passage, I conceive is this; When you do cele-
 “brate the Sacrament, no man can suspect that you do,
 “or can pass by, or omit *illud legitimum*, &c. that is,
 “that our Saviour hath said, *Drink ye all of it, for this*
 “*is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.*
 “Which expressly contradicts your notion that the Catho-
 “lick Church consists only of such a small number as you
 “are. *Optatus* immediately proceeds to convince them fur-
 “ther by what they do affirm they do in their Celebrati-
 “on of the Sacrament. *Offerre vos deo dicitis pro Ecclesia quæ*
 “*una est, hoc ipsum mendacit pars est, quam te vocare, de*
 “*qua feceris duas, & offerre vos dicitis pro una Ecclesia, quæ*
 “*fit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa.* Here *Optatus* doth not
 “argue from any Form of Prayer, which he pretends
 “was extant, and imposed on the Church, (as the Dr.
 “insinuates) but from what the *Donatists* did declare was
 “their practice; nor is here any evidence, that they were
 “bound up to precise words: for the account *Optatus*
 “here reports, they gave of their own practice, is vari-
 “ously expressed. *Optatus* in another place tells the *Do-*
 “*natists*, they did divide the Church, and were Ene-
 “mies to Peace, and yet their *Salutations* did contradict,
 “or were inconsistent with their practice. *Persuasionibus*
 “*vestris divisa sunt corpora & nomina pietatis, & non po-*
 “*tuitis*

Ibidem.

Opt. lib. 3. p. 95.

*enistis praeferre, quod legitimum est. Vtique dicitur istis, pax
 vobiscum.* This the Doctor alledgeth as "another Form
 of Ecclesiastical appointment. Whereas *Optatus* (I
 think) gives it only as an instance of their *Hypocrisy*. P. 14.
 That whereas they laboured to divide the Church and
 make differences in Families, yet they could not avoid
 saluting people with these lawful words, he immediate-
 ly adds, *Cum Deus contra, pax, & ubi pax: hoc est dice-
 re, quid salutas, de quo non habes quod nomines?* The next
 passage the Doctor quotes out of this Author, is a proof
 that the *Donatists* did use the Lords Prayer. Here it
 may be fit to mind you that the *Donatists* did not differ
 from other Christians either in Faith, or Worship, but
 principally in discipline. And *Optatus* doth own this; and
 where he relates their agreement with other Christians
 he takes no notice of either of their using any Form of
 Prayer, besides the Lords Prayer. He gives this ac-
 count of their agreement with other Christians. *Cum
 constaret merito, quia nobis & vobis, Ecclesiastica una est
 conversatio, & si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant
 Sacramenta; denique possumus & nos dicere, pares credimus
 & uno sigillo signati sumus, nec aliter baptizati quam vos.
 Testamentum divinum legimus pariter, unum Deum roga-
 mus,* (but he says not a word of their Praying unto
 God by the sole use of prescribed Forms) *Oratio domini-
 ca apud nos, & apud vos una est.* He saith not any such
 thing of their other Prayers. Again, saith *Optatus* in
 another place, *Denique & apud vos, & apud nos una est
 Ecclesiastica conversatio, Communes lectiones, eadem fides,
 ipsa fidei Sacramenta, eadem mysteria,* but not a word
 here of prescribed Forms, or that they agreed in using
 the same Forms of Prayer. But saith the Doctor, "More-
 over we find in *Optatus* that there was a Rumor spread
 upon the coming of some from the Emperor, that
 alte-

*Optat. lib. 3.
 P. 49.*

*Optat. lib. 5.
 P. 136.*

P. 135.

"alterations would be made in the Communion Ser-
 "vice, which startled the people, but they were quiet-
 "ed again, when they saw the solemn customs, and
 "wonted Rites observed, and discerned that nothing
 "was changed, added, or diminished in the divine
 "Sacrifice. Here the Doctor gives no account what
 the alteration was, which it was rumord would be
 made, but discourses of this alteration, as if there had
 been Forms of Prayer, and the Words and Phrases of
 those Prayers, were like to be altered. But if the al-
 teration the people fear'd, had been made, it would
 have been such, they would have perceived it better,
 by their eyes, than by the good understanding they
 had of accustomed Words and Phrases. For the altera-
 tion *Optatus* speaks of, was not a change of words in their
 Prayers, but the placing of an Image upon the Altar
 before the Celebration of the Sacrament. *Optatus* his
 account of the matter is in these words. *Dicbatur*

Optat. Milev.
lib. 3. p. 113.
 114)

*enim ille tempore, venturas Paulum & Macarium, qui in-
 teressent Sacrificiis, ut cum altaria solemniter apparerent, pre-
 ferrent illis Imaginem, quam prius in altare ponerant, sic
 sacrificium offerretur. Hoc cum acciperent aurea, percussi
 sunt & aures, uniuscuiusque lingua in hac verba commota
 est, ut omnis qui hoc audiret diceret, Qui degustat, do-
 Sacra gustat. & recte dictum erat, si talem famam, simi-
 lis veritas sequeretur. At ubi ventum est à supradictis,
 & nihil tale visum est ex eo quod fuerat paulante mentita
 fama, nihil viderunt oculi Christiani, quod horrent, nihil
 probavit aspectus ex iis, quibus perturbatus erat auditus.
 Risa est puritas, & rita solito solennis consuetudo perspec-
 ta est, cum viderent divinis sacrificiis, nec mutatum quic-
 quam, nec additionem, nec ablatum, pax à deo commendata,
 voluntibus placuit. You may find the very same rela-
 tion again in *Optatus*, lib. 7. p. 199. &c. The Doctor
 refers*

refers to one or two expressions more in this Author, but they are such as do not relate to Prayers, and therefore I need not concern my self about them. But the Doctor saith, "when we put all this together, we may conclude they had a written Liturgy in *Africa* in his time, and it is very probable that this Book of Prayers, was one of those Books (in the plural number) which the *Donatists* (as he complains) took away from the holy Altar. But those Books *Opera* doth speak of, I conceive were only the Books of the holy Scripture. He calls them, *divine legis instrumenta* which phrase (I think) will hardly take in Liturgies of meer human compoſure *per indicia ſacralia & leges publicas, divine legis instrumenta, executione officiorum à plurimis eripienda eſſe dixiſtis.* *Operat. lib. 6. P. 195.*

In the next place the Doctor introduceth *Epiphanius* with a kind of an Apology why he affords ſo little evidence for Liturgies. "We can expect no great account of the ſacred Forms in *Epiphanius*, ſince he is ſo very nice in ſpeaking of Myſteries. This ſeems to be but a very indifferent reaſon why we may not expect from him an account that the Church was tyed up to Forms, unleſs he accounted the uſe of Forms, one of the Myſteries. Indeed, that the Ancients were confin'd to Forms of Prayer in their adminiſtrations, doth ſtill continue a Myſtery to me: notwithstanding all the pains the Doctor hath been at, "to give a clearer and fuller account, of the early beginning, and general uſe of Liturgick Forms, than hath yet been done, by any who have writ upon this ſubject. The Doctor *Dr. s. Introducti-* proves *Epiphanius* his niceneſs in ſpeaking of myſteries, from his not repeating the words of our Saviour's Inſtitution. This I think is no great argument of his niceneſs, becauſe tho he does not repeat the words him-

Epiph. Ancorat.
G. 57. p. 60.

Page 137.

self, yet he refers his reader to the Gospel, where they are to be found. And he reckons it (saith the Doctor) a ridiculous thing in the "Marcionites to celebrate their mysteries before the "Catechumens. And well he might charge this, as an absurdity, since it clash't so openly with the common notion of mysteries in those days. But I do not perceive how this is a proof that Epiphanius was nice in speaking of mysteries, much less why it should obstruct his declaring plainly, that the Offices of the Church were constantly performed by prescribed forms of Prayer, if they were so in his days. "For his own part (says the Doctor) he will say no more, when "he comes to describe the Celebration of the Sacraments, but this; The other mysteries of the *Laven* " (i. e. Baptism) and the internal mysteries (i. e. the "Eucharist) are performed according to the Tradition "of the Gospel and of the Apostles. (so that here is no more evidence of Forms of Prayer being used in these Offices, than the Gospels, and the Writings of the Apostles do afford, which I think is none at all) "only (saith the Doctor) he saith there were in the "Church constantly Morning Hymns and Morning "Prayers, as also Prayers and Psalms at Evening or "candle lighting. This account the Doctor hath from Epiphanius (if you have a mind to view it in Epiphanius himself and will consult Petavius his Edition at Paris, you may turn to *Panar. lib. 3. tom. 2. p. 1106*) But what is all this to a stinted Liturgy? could not Prayers be performed Morning and Evening, unless there were prescribed Forms? The Doctor adds "tho he "doth not tell us what the several Forms were (no "nor he doth not say, they were Forms) "yet we "may be assured they used Forms then in the Churches "of

"of Cyprus. But how may we be assured of this? First
 "saith the Doctor) Because they did so in all the other
 "Churches wherewith *Epiphanius* held Communion.
 But for this we have only the Doctors assertion, and
 no proof, which is just as much, as to prove they had
 Forms, because they had. Besides the Reason is la-
 mentably weak, supposing the assertion true, unless
 either the Communion of Churches does depend upon
 their using Forms of Prayer, or *Epiphanius* would
 hold Communion with no Churches, but those which
 did agree with him in the outward mode of Worship.
 "Secondly, Because he doth so highly commend the
 "Apostolical Constitutions, as containing all regular or-
 "der, and being agreeable to the true and orthodox way
 "of Worship, and yet we have seen there is a prescrib-
 "ed Liturgy, and compleat Forms of Prayer for all
 "occasions, set down in those Constitutions. *Epiphanius*
 "hath something to the same effect the Doctor reports,
 as you may see *Panar. Lib. 3 Tom. 1 p. 822.* So that
 it seems there was a Book at that time, which went
 under the Name of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which
 tho it were not of very great account with some, yet *Epi-*
phanius thought ought not to be rejected. But what Book
 this was, we do not certainly know, nor does it ap-
 pear by any thing in *Epiphanius*, that there were Forms
 of Prayer in it, or if there were, that those Prayers were
 enjoined on any Church, or used by any Church. The
 Doctor pretends it was the Book which passeth now
 under that name, but he giveth no proof that it was
 the same Book. And some Reasons may be alledged
 why the Book *Turrianus* hath published under this Ti-
 tle may not be allowed to be the same with that *Epi-*
phanius doth speak of. But the proof lying on the
 Doctors side, I will not divert you any further, than
 by

Dionys. Petav.
Animadver. in
Epiph. p. 290.

by giving you an account of what the learned Petavius doth say of it, *De Apostolicis istis constitutionibus dubitatum à nonnullis præfatus Epiphanius. Quæ eodem nomine circumferuntur habet in octo libris disticta, quæ à prioribus illis, ac nihilominus dubiis quarum meminit Epiphanius diversæ videntur.* — apparet igitur aliud fuisse Constitutionum genus, quàm quibus hæc Clemencis nomen inscribitur. “Thirdly, because he derides Montanus and “other Hereticks, for pretending to Inspiration, and “such extraordinary gifts of the Spirit as were then “ceased. Who would ever have imagined that a Doctor should alledge this as a Reason to assure people, that no Prayers but prescribed Forms were used at Cyprus in Epiphanius his days? Is there no Medium betwixt Inspiration, or Extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and Forms of Prayer composed by other people? The Doctor proceeds in the next place, to consider a passage Mr. Clarkson had produced from this Father, to prove that the Prayer for all sorts of people in general, at the Celebration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not a prescribed Form. The Doctor thinks this passage is evidence for Liturgies, and that the general Prayer was a prescribed Form. This passage is taken out of an Epistle which Epiphanius wrote to John Bishop of Jerusalem, which is only extant in Latin, and was translated into Latin by S. Jerom. In this Epistle, Epiphanius does endeavour to pacify John Bishop of Jerusalem, and to vindicate himself from some aspersions which were cast upon him: Amongst others this was one, that when he did celebrate the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, he did pray for John Bishop of Jerusalem in such a manner, or in such words as were apt to beget in the people a belief that he was not Orthodox. *Quod in oratione quando offerimus sacrificia Deo, soleamus*

*fulcentus pro te dicere, Domine presta Jobanni, ut resso-
crescat. This was the charge against Epiphanius: He
vindicates himself, declaring he did not thus express
himself in his Prayer, and assigns the reason why he
did not express himself in that manner. And then re-
lates in what kind of words he did pray for him:
Noli vos in tantum putare Rusticos, ut hoc tam aperte di-
cere potuerimus, quoniam enim hoc in corde meo semper
erem, tamen ut simplicitas fateretur, nunquam in alienos aures
protuli, ne te viderem parvipendere, dilectissime. The
reason why he did not use those words, was not be-
cause he had a Liturgy which bound him up to the use
of other words, but because he thought those words
were too rude, and from a prudential, or charitable
consideration. Quando autem complens orationem se-
cundum ritum mysteriorum. & pro omnibus, & pro te quoque
dicimus, Custodi illum qui praeclamat veritatem; vel certe
ita, Tu presta Domine, & custodi, ut ille verbum praedicet
veritatis, sicut occasio sermonis se tulerit, & habuerit ora-
tis consequentiam. This is the passage about which
the dispute is. "The right understanding of this (saith
"the Doctor) depends upon observing three things:
"First, That he affirms he performed this Prayer (se-
"cundum ritum mysteriorum) according to the usual Of-
"fice for the Sacrament. And Mr. Clarksen doth ac-
knowledge, that it was the usual and ordinary practice
of the Church, when the Sacrament was Celebrated,
even earlier than Epiphanius his time, to Pray for all
sorts of people, or to use a Prayer much like that we
call, the Prayer for all sorts of people; but tho they
did usually Pray for the same things and persons in
most Churches on this occasion, yet he did not find
any evidence that the administrators were yet confin-
ed in any Church to use always just the same precise num-
ber of words. But saith the Doctor, "had the Greek
been*

Epiph. Tom. 2.
P. 313.

P. 132.

P. 140.

P. 140.

"been extant, probably it would have been [*ἡ ἐκκλησία*] And if that Greek had been extant, I do not
 see how the Doctor could have made any great advan-
 tage of it. But I rather think if *ἐκκλησία*, had had the
 same signification in *Epiphanius* his days, it has had in
 some Liturgies of much later date, it would have been
ἐκκλησία *ἡ ἐκκλησία*, "Secondly, That he saith that it
 "was one of the two ways mentioned, as occasion re-
 "quired, (*Ἐὰν ἂν ἦτορ ὁ λόγος ἐκτελέσθαι*) Now *ἐκτελέσθαι*
 "(which is literally translated here, *Consequentiam*)
 "signifies an order prescribed. And the Doctor fur-
 "ther observes that the Author of the Constitutions,
 "*Epiphanius* his friend, hath two Forms of Prayer,
 "wherein the Bishops are prayed for at the time of the
 "Sacrament; the sense of both Forms being much the
 "same with what *Epiphanius* saith he prayed, but the
 "words are somewhat different. And the Doctor
 "think's it is very likely, there were two ways for pray-
 "ing for the Bishops, in the Forms for *Cyprus*, and that
 "*Epiphanius* kept strictly to the words of his Forms.
 Here you may observe, that the weight of this obser-
 vation doth depend on the meaning of these words [*fi-
 cut occasio sermonis se tulerit, Ἐὰν ἂν ἦτορ ὁ λόγος ἐκτελέσθαι*] but the meaning of these words, doth not depend
 on that observation, as the Doctor pretends, and is
 therefore fain to translate them thus, *as the occasion re-
 quired, and as the Office for Prayer directed*, which trans-
 lation, I conceive the words will hardly bear: Their
 sense (I think) is rather this; *As the occasion of my dis-
 course requires, and so as my discourse may have a consistency,
 and be intelligible*. It is evident *Epiphanius* did not al-
 ways pray for him in the same words, yet he prayed
 one of these two ways for him. To make this matter
 more plain, you may take notice that *Epiphanius* when
 he prayed for *John of Jerusalem*, did consider him, ei-
 ther

P. 146

P. 163.

help of *Isaiah*, attended with a signification, we have no proof either *Ephraim* or *John of Jerusalem*, ever heard of. And certainly *Ephraim* was not so dull a man but he could have referred again to his Common prayer book (if he had had one) much more intelligibly than he does here. But supposing upon such an extraordinary occasion *Ephraim* had varied a little from the Prayer in his Liturgy, as he did on such a Supposition the Doctor says. The practice of such an eminent Bishop on such an occasion will make nothing for the Liberty of the inferior Clergy. But if a Liturgy was imposed on *Ephraim*, and he was obliged not to use any Prayers but what were in that Liturgy, nor no words in his Prayers but what were there prescribed, nor in any other order than that wherein they were there placed, pray how came he (notwithstanding his *Isaiah*) to have more liberty to break *his* *Isaiah*, than an inferior Clergy man? Is he greater and more bulky *Isaiah* here, than more Authority or Liberty when celebrating the Sacrament (if my understanding do not fail me) to vary from the Communion Service, than the poorest and most *Isaiah* Priest in the Land.

Pag. 138.

Gregory Nazianzen is the Doctor's next Author, in whom by the Doctor's own acknowledgment, we have very little evidence. But what the Doctor produces out of *Gregory* is not his own, but the passage in the *Isaiah* from *Isaiah* himself, or *Julian*. I have under this passage made some notes to it and therefore need not say any more of it in this place: but I must observe, that the Doctor has not, or rather has not, given us the words of *Gregory*, or rather of his *Isaiah*, but only the words of the *Isaiah* which I have given in the passage before. And thus the

Pag. 142.

Mar. in Feb.
Grat. in

therefore he endeavoured to introduce amongst the Pagans a Conformity to the Christians, more especial- Socr. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 16.
ly in their Manners : *ἵνα καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες τὸν οὐκ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἴδωσι τὸν Χριστιανισμόν, &c.*
And you may see a further Confirmation of this in *Julian's Epistle to Arfacius*. The Doctor's second observation is of no use at all, since it depends entirely on his own Interpretation of *Nazianzen's Phrase*, which I have already shewn cannot well consist with *Truth or good Sense*.

After this, the Doctor proceeds to take notice of two places which *Mr. Clarkson* had quoted out of *Nazianzen*. The first is a passage where *Nazianzen* being to discourse of the Holy Ghost, prays *that the Spirit may be present with him* [*ἐνδύσθω ἅγιον, &c.*] and give *Nazianz. Orat. 44.*
him such Expressions as he desires, or if not so much, yet what may be agreeable to the Season.

The Doctor doth not like this Translation, Give P. 143.
such Expressions; but would have it, *give such a faculty of discoursing*; for my part, I think the former Translation (notwithstanding the difference in number) is most pertinent. He had the faculty already, so that if more pertinent words and expressions should occur, he had the faculty to utter them, and discourse with them.

The Doctor doth further say; "This is not properly a Prayer, but a Rhetorical Apostrophe; and it is nothing to the Church's Publick Prayers. But with the Doctor's good leave, it may be somewhat to a Liturgy in the present acceptation of that word; considering that *Nazianzen* did apprehend that People were to have a dependance on the assistance of the Spirit both in their Meditations and Discourses [*ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ, &c.*] Orat. id.
we have reason to conclude he was sincere, when he desired :

desired the Spirit might furnish him with Expressions (or if the Doctor will have it his own way, a *faculty*) and that he did intend, if by the assistance of the Spirit he were furnished with better Expressions than had before occurred to him, to make use of them. For without doubt he prayed for such a Gift, with a design to make use of it, and not with the wicked Servant to wrap it up in a Napkin, and let it lie idle. And if he thought he ought in his Ministrations to use the best and fittest Expressions he could, can it be imagined he would be tied up to Forms from which he might not vary, the more proper and apt Expressions should occur to him, than what were in those Forms? If it should be objected, That *Nazianzen* here only prays that he may be furnished with agreeable Expressions in his Preaching, and not with reference to his Prayers; I must needs say, I take the Objection to be very frivolous, unless it can be proved, that the Ministers ought to use the best, and most pertinent Expressions they can in their Sermons, yet they may not do so in their Prayers.

The second place the Doctor takes notice of, which Mr. *Clarkson* alledged for his purpose out of *Nazianzen*, is a Relation which *Nazianzen* gave concerning his Father, who being very ill, yet recovering a little strength, did by the help of his Servant, rise out of his Bed, and celebrated the Mysteries of the People in a few words, but with a mind very perfect (O admirable! without a Pulpit on the Pulpit, a Sacrificer without an Altar, a Priest at a distance from the things to be consecrated) but these things were made present to him by the Holy Spirit, as he knew; and those who were present, did not perceive them: After this repeating

peating the accustomed words of the Eucharist, and blessing the People, he went to bed again. In this Relation there are two things Mr. *Clarkson* takes notice of: First, That celebrating the Eucharist, he is said to do it with few words, so that he was briefer, and used fewer words in his Prayers at this time, than he was wont to do when in health. Secondly, That if in this Sentence (τὰς αὐτὰς λέξεις ἀντὶ τῆς ἐννοίας) *τὰς αὐτὰς λέξεις*, which seems most congruous, he tells us, those words wherewith he celebrated, were suggested to him by the Holy Ghost. The Doctor tells us these things from this Quotation: First, "This was a private Communion celebrated in his Chamber. I will not dispute that point. But you may not be ignorant, that there was another way then for furnishing the Sick with the Sacrament, than what we now call *private Communion*. " And (saith the Doctor) he performed it as nigh the publick Forms as he was able. As for publick imposed Forms at this time, I am yet to seek; and for ought that yet appears, so might this old Father be too. But I am of the opinion he did perform it as near the way he was wont to observe, as he was able. " And (saith the Doctor) he kept strictly to the words of Consecration. Whether τὰς αὐτὰς ἐννοίας λέξεις, signifie the words of Consecration, I am not certain, but take them in that Sence; and that he used the same words for Consecration now, which he was accustomed to use; and that he always used the same words without any variation on this occasion, I do not understand how that can be drawn into such a length, as to be a Proof of a prescribed Liturgy at that time, as the Doctor would have it. " Secondly (saith the Doctor) our Adversary, both in his Latin and Greek, omits

P. 76, &c.

P. 149.

P. 146.

"omits all those words, viz. of his being without a
 "Pulpit, an Altar, and things to be consecrated. And
 truly I see no hurt in that omission: For those words
 are no part of the Story or Relation *Nazianzen* was
 reporting; but are only a Rhetorical Excursion or
 Transport. And the History is just the same without
 them, as with them. "And then (saith the Doctor)
 "he would make us believe that [*ῥᾶνλα*] refers to his
 "Abbreviation of the Office to his short words, that so
 "he may pretend those words were given him by the
 "Inspiration of the Spirit, which is a manifest falsifying
 "of the Father, who saith, the Pulpit, Altar, and
 "consecrated Things, [*ῥᾶνλα*] These things were made
 "present to him by the Holy Ghost. Here the mat-
 ter in dispute is, Whether [*ῥᾶνλα*] is to be referred
 to [*ῥᾶνλα*] or to the Pulpit, Altar, and consecrated
 Things? Mr. *Clarkson* thought it referred to *ῥᾶνλα*, and
 he exprest himself very modestly about it, as you
 may see by what I have related from him a little be-
 fore. The Doctor thinks it must be referred to the
 Pulpit, &c. And he speaks of it in a blustering man-
 ner, and with great assurance; if the old observation
 do here hold true (That those who write with the
 greatest modesty, do write with the greatest Judg-
 ment) Mr. *Clarkson* will be likely to have the ad-
 vantage of the Doctor. This, I think, is plain, that
 what Mr. *Clarkson* doth refer *ῥᾶνλα* unto, is part of
 the Story *Nazianzen* was relating; but what the Do-
 ctor refers *ῥᾶνλα* unto, is no part of the Story, but is
 to be read as a Parenthesis. And further, I do not
 discern any reason we have to think that *Nazianzen*
 had suck'd in such a Notion as this, That it was
 the Office of the Spirit to make Pulpits, Altars, and
 such kind of things present to People, when they
 were

But it appears by a Passage before related, that *Nazianzen* did think that People might by the assistance of the Spirit, be furnished with proper words in their religious Performances. The Doctor takes occasion from Mr. *Clarkson's* referring *ταῦτα* to *ῥήματα*, to treat him with some Rudeness, and to sprinkle some scurvy Expressions. And he draws to the Conclusion of his Discourse from this Father, with these words: "But I doubt not all impartial Men will gather from this very instance truly represented, that *Nazianzen's* Father always used a Liturgy in the Church, and that the Son means those publick prescribed Forms, when he tells us, He was always better when he could get to the Church; for the bare saying of the Liturgy cured him. If the old Father had a Liturgy, and this were true, it was a notable Liturgy indeed. But I wonder why folks should be so fond of turning Liturgies into Charms; or how it should come about, that the bare saying over of words just as they lie in prescribed Forms of Prayer, should have more Virtue to cure Diseases, and ease and strengthen old Men when in great Pain, and under very much Weakness, than their saying over any other words can have? But perhaps you will say, If *Nazianzen* the Doctor's Author, doth say so, how can the Doctor help it? But I think *Nazianzen* doth not say so: *Nazianzen* saith there was something peculiar, and even miraculous attending his Father in his last Sickness, which was this; That whereas he was daily and frequently, even every day, and sometimes every hour, very grievously afflicted with Pain or Sicknes [*καὶ μὲν ἐπιβόησεν ἀσθενήσας*] he was (not cured (as the Doctor saith) by the bare saying of the Li

P. 147.

*Nazianz. Orat.*19.
turgy)

turgy) in ease, or was strengthened, or was pretty well only at the time of Divine Worship. And this (saith the Doctor) may suffice for Gregory Nazianzen: And in this the Doctor and I are perfectly agreed.

P. 148.

The Doctor doth bring in S. Basil next. And propounds three heads of discourse. First, we begin with his evidence for publick Forms. "And the first shall be his vindication of that way of praising God, which he had set up at Neocesarea. But this passage (I think) doth not make at all for imposed Liturgies. You may read the passage at large in the Doctor. The account

S. Bas. Epist. 63
adlep. Neocesar.

P. 151.

of the practice S. Basil vindicates in short is this. They sang Psalms alternately, then they applied themselves to Prayer, and afterwards sang again in another manner. But here is not a word of the use of prescribed Forms of Prayer. "In this very Epistle (saith the Doctor) S. Basil mentions a Litany with approbation. It is true S. Basil doth say, they at Neocesarea used Litanies, or made solemn supplications unto God. But he doth not say their Litanies were prescribed Forms, nor that they were performed in that alternate manner, which hath generally prevailed in latter Ages. *Litania*, (I think) did then signify no more than a solemn supplication, for the pardon of Sin. The word it self doth not contain in it any thing that can oblige us to conclude these supplications were to consist of prescribed words. Tho I acknowledge in later time, it hath been ordinarily used in a restrained sense. "But (saith the Doctor) Litanies were Forms of supplications for pardon of Sin, and averting judgments wherein the people always bare a part. 'Tis true they have been so a great while. But the Doctor hath offered no proof that they were so then. "Yea (saith the Doctor) there are two passages
" of

" of this very Litany, or some other as ancient, which P. id.
 " are mentioned in *S. Basil's* Epistles. The first is this,
 " we pray that the rest of our days may continue in
 " peace, we request that our death may also be in peace.
 " But (saith the Doctor) we cannot be certain these are
 " the very Words of the publick Form; but they are
 " certainly in the Litanick way. By this way of
 Discourse, any passage in a Letter that happens to
 be writ in the *Litanick Way*, may serve for a proof
 of an *imposed Litany*. And if so, any man may easily
 be *voluminous* in heaping up proofs of *prescribed Li-*
turgies. *S. Basil* is in this Epistle perswading to *peace* Epist. 68.
 and *concord*; and having alledged several Reasons to
 inforce his Exhortation, saith; For these Reasons we
 do pray that we may live in peace, &c. but he saith
 not a word of their doing so, because this was *part*
 of *their imposed Litany*. " The second place in *S. Ba-*
 " *sil* is an Epistle which he writ to a Friend that P. 152.
 " was gone into *Schythia*, &c. wherein he tells him,
 " he could not but remember the Offices of the
 " Church, wherein we interceed for our Brethren
 " who are gone to travel, &c. Here the Doctor
 thinks " *S. Basil* picks those passages out of the Lita-
 " ny, which belonged to this Man's Circumstances.
 " And (saith the Doctor) all that are acquainted
 " with ancient Forms of Litany, know they always
 " prayed for Christians travelling in strange Coun-
 tries, &c. But for all that, they may want proof
 there were any imposed Forms of Litany in *S. Ba-*
sil's days. And they may be certain, that the Chri-
 stians travelling in strange Countries, were constant-
 ly prayed for in the Church, before there were
 any imposed Forms of Litany. Mr. *Clarkson* had
 taken notice of this Passage, and had said of it, and

P. 138.

some other passages : " Here is in these severals, some
 " account for what, and for whom they prayed, but
 " not a syllable to signifie that they did it in set
 " and prescribed Forms. If those that pray without
 " such Forms, were to give an account of the Scope
 " and Import of their usual Prayers, and to express
 " for what Persons and Things they ordinarily do
 " pray ; they would do it in such terms as might
 " be as just a ground for our Author's Inference, as
 any alledged. In answer to this, the Doctor saith
 no more but only this ; " Our Adversary indeed bold-
 " ly affirms this Passage is not sufficient to prove the
 " use of Forms. Is not this a very *Scholastical* way
 of answering an Adversary ? At this rate any man
 who is but imperious enough, may pretend to an-
 swer the most Learned and Rational Author in the
 World. Nor is the matter mended at all by the
 Doctor's resolving there must be a Litany in St. *Ba-
 sil's* time, because of the exact agreement betwixt
 this and the ancient Litanies ; for we have no proof
 yet, that there was any imposed Litany so ancient
 as St. *Basil*.

P. 153.

P. id.

" Thirdly, There are many Evidences that he ap-
 " proved of Forms of Prayer ; for he commends
 " the way of praying by conjoynd Voices in Re-
 sponses. The first instance the Doctor gives of this,
 is in the forementioned 68th. Epistle, where S. *Basil*
 perswading to Concord, amongst other things, al-
 ledgeth, *That nothing can be so well done by one alone,*
as it may with concurrent assistance. And to explain
 and clear this, he saith, *That private Prayer is not so*
powerful or prevalent, as publick ; the Lord having
promised to be present where two or three agree together
in calling upon his Name. His second instance is just
 like

like the first; and only notes, That publick Prayer is more prevalent than private. But the Doctor is big with a Notion, that People cannot joyn together with the Priest in Prayer, nor have communion in the Duty of Prayer, unless there be Forms of Prayer composed, and these Forms be divided into several Portions; some of which Portions the People are to utter audibly in answer to the Priest, when he hath said his part. And this Notion the Doctor thinks warranted by his finding *placitum est* *negotiumque necessarium*, in St. Basil. But if this Notion be sound, what becomes of the Peoples Communion in those Prayers which are to be read entirely by the Priest himself? “ And for this Reason (saith the Doctor) he made a Canon or Form of Prayer for his Monks, &c. To all the Doctor doth say about this *Canon of Prayer*, I only give this short Answer; That I think whoever reads the place in S. Basil, will easily perceive the Doctor doth not give a right account of what S. Basil meant by the *Canon of Prayer*. Here is no proof that he made his Monks any Form of Prayer, which they were obliged constantly to use. And for the Canon of Prayer he speaks of, I think it is very evident, that it was not a *Form of Prayer*, as the Doctor pretends, but only the Counsel or Advice he gave them concerning that proportion of time they should imploy in Prayer. And the Canon he speaks of, was plainly this, *to set apart such proportion of their time for Prayer, as they did allow for those things which were necessary for their Bodies.* And he would not have them listen to any Thought or Suggestion which might tempt them to spend less time in Prayer than they did about those things which were necessary for their

P. 154.

P. id.

Basil. Ascet.

their Bodies. The Doctor's next passage about learning the Psalms by heart, is a very weak instance; and the next, of the words used by the people at *Candle-lighting*, is a very mean proof of a prescribed Liturgy imposed on them who were to officiate in the publick Worship.

P. 155.

The Doctor, in the second place, applies himself to answer Mr. *Clarkson's* Objections: "First, S. *Basil* (saith Mr. *Clarkson*) was against writing down "Mysteries, and so could not be for written Forms; "and this he proves by his Epistle to *Meletius*, &c. "To this (saith the Doctor) This was only private "business to a Friend; wherefore the Alligation is impertinent. But I answer; Mr. *Clarkson* did not produce this Epistle to prove any thing directly concerning Divine Offices, but only to shew that S. *Basil* entertained this Notion, That writing of a matter, was accounted a publishing of it: And his quotation out of this Epistle, is express to that purpose, p. 37.

P. id. &c.

In the next place, the Doctor hath a long Discourse about a passage Mr. *Clarkson* quoted out of S. *Basil de Spiritu Sancto*: Here the Doctor blames Mr. *Clarkson* for laying so much stress on a Tract which he himself suspects. But I do not mind that he hath given any intimation of his suspecting it; I am sure in his Answer to an Objection concerning the latter part of the Book, he saith, The generality of Protestant Writers do not question it, p. 110. But the Doctor thinks the passage makes for him: This, I think, is clear from the place, that he saith, That they used Prayers at the Celebration of the Eucharist, according as they understood by Tradition, that that had been the Use of the Church. But I do not see any

any Evidence that they used the same Prayers which had been formerly used, or that they used any prescribed Forms. The greatest part of the Doctor's Discourse here, is about the (*τα δ'εσσα.*) The Question is, Whether by the *Writings* wherein S. Basil saith the things he discourses of, were not, he meant the Holy Scriptures only, or all Writings whatsoever? Persons of very great note, are of opinion, that S. Basil meant all Writings whatsoever; and Mr. *Clarkson* was of that mind. If Mr. *Clarkson* did herein mistake, he mistook with others of more than usual Worth, Learning, and Note: And therefore his mistake cannot reasonably be thought of such a nature as to deserve *Tragical Exclamations*. It is not for me to be positive in determining a point; about which I perceive Men of so great Learning do differ. The Doctor thinks S. Basil meant only the Holy Scriptures, by those Writings he speaks of; and I do acknowledge that according to the present Apprehensions I have of this matter, I think the Doctor is in the right. After this, the Doctor entertains his Reader for several pages, with a Discourse about S. Basil's using the Doxology variously *in prayer with the people*: And he endeavours to shew, That *in prayer with the people*, may signifie *in Conclusion of the Homily*; and then tells of S. Basil's danger of falling into Heresy; and at last favours the World with an approved *Recipe* to prevent Heresy. But these things I pass silently over, because the whole Discourse seems to be a meer flight of Imagination a little cramped. In the next place the Doctor takes notice of Mr. *Clarkson's* affirming, that S. Basil did not teach his Monks to pray by any Liturgy, but to use Scripture Expressions. To which the Doctor answers, *These*
are

Basil. de Spir.
Sanct. cap. 127.

*Basil. Constitut.
Mon. cap. 1.*

are *Directions for private Prayer*. Here I think the Doctor is again in the right: But I must further acquaint you, that I cannot find any Forms of Prayer in that Book which the Monks were obliged constantly to use. Nor does *S. Basil* say a word of their making Forms for themselves: But he adviseth them to use *Scripture-Expressions*; and having begun their Addresses to God by way of praise, or Doxology, as well as they were able in the use of *Scripture-Expressions*; then to betake themselves to Self-abasement; that is, to acknowledge their Sin, and Guilt, and unworthiness; and having insisted largely on that, then to proceed to ask such things as the *Holy Scriptures* do warrant them to ask. What the Doctor saith further, p. 165, and 166. pertains not to the business in hand; and therefore I shall say no more, but that I think every man may be the fittest Judge to determine concerning himself, whether his mind is best disposed in the Use of a Form, or without it.

P. 165. &c.

The Doctor, in the last place, makes it his business to prove, That *S. Basil* himself made a Liturgy. But whether he made a Liturgy or not, is not very material to the point in hand. And therefore tho' much of the Doctor's Evidence is not very solid, I will wave a particular discovery of its weakness, and more especially because the Doctor doth not offer it as proof, that this Liturgy was so imposed on the Church at *Cesarea*, or any other Church, that the Administrators were obliged in their Administrations to use that Liturgy, and no Prayers but what were in that Liturgy, which was the main thing the Doctor should have proved. But it is not very apparent how *S. Basil* who (as the Doctor saith, pag 164.) was forced to beg pardon for his having

having altered that Doxology the people had been accustomed unto, should obtain so much Authority as to cause their old beloved *Liturgy* (if they had one before) to be wholly laid aside, and to impose a new one of his own making upon them.

Sir, I did intend to have proceeded, and to have given you an account of what the Doctor hath alledged from other Authors in this Century, but I find my Papers begin to swell beyond my Expectation, and therefore I will here desist. I have gone thorough the greatest part of this fourth Century, and so have past over a considerable space of time wherein there is no pretence of *extraordinary and miraculous Gifts*, and wherein the Church had been settled under Christian Magistrates. And hitherto I think we have not had any substantial proof of such a Liturgy, as is the point in debate betwixt Mr. Clarkson and Dr. Comber. And if this be so, we may have some reason to think, that neither the ceasing of pretended *miraculous Gifts*, nor the settling of the Church under Christian Magistrates, gave birth to prescribed Liturgies; but that prescribed Liturgies are of a later Date, and owe their Original to something else than the Doctor hath alledged.

I must acknowledge, Sir, I do not admire the Doctor's way of proving the use of Liturgies in the times of the Ancient Fathers. I think he might have produced as many, and as pertinent Quotations out of the Writings of those who were wont to be called *Dissenters*, to prove that they were bound up to a prescribed Liturgy in their Administrations, as he hath alledged out of the Ancients to prove the point in their days. And if he had done so, I am perswaded

all who understand their practice, would have concluded his performance a very indifferent and odd sort of proof.

I suppose the length of these Papers may well nigh have tired you: And seeing a satisfaction neither proportionable to my pains in Writing, nor to yours in Reading, doth issue from an Examination of such scanty and fruitless Quotations, I hope you will not expect a Continuation of this Work from

Your

Most Affectionate Friend,

And Faithful Servant,

S. B

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 3. l. 1. for Quotations, r. Evidences. l. 27. for their, r. Her. p. 5. l. 23. for eo ab, r. ab eo. p. 10. l. 25. after Apology, r. as. p. 11. marg. r. pag. 68. l. 32. after make, r. till Prayer was ended. l. 33. for declaring, r. manifesting. p. 24. l. 4. after do, for nor, r. we. l. ult. for neither, r. nor. p. 26. l. 1. for framed, r. forged. l. ult. for another Treatise of Athanasius, viz. his Synopsis, r. some other Epist. or the Treatise titled Synop. sac. Scrip. p. 28. l. 1. for prove, r. have proved. l. ult. r. Quotations. p. 30. l. 1. for Liturgy, r. Λειτουργία. p. 34. l. 2. & 3. for the word Ἀλλογενία, r. finding the word Ἀλλογενία, in an Author. p. 35. l. ult. for meddle with, r. explain. p. 38. l. 9. after that, r. the Prayers in p. 42. l. 1. for refers to, r. reports. l. 12. r. judicio. l. ult. dele himself. p. 48. l. ult. dele timer. p. 49. l. 10, 11. for in a different manner. r. with different expressions. p. 51. l. 1. after John, r. Bishop. l. 22. r. Nazianzen. p. 56. l. ult. dele when they were.

